

**A Study of *The Professor*:
Hunsden as a Catalyst in the Whirl of Passion**

by

Maki Sakata

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of the Graduate School of
Osaka City University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts

January 2022

Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1 Hunsden and William	6
1-1 Hunsden's Character	6
1-2 William's Character	12
1-3 Relations between Hunsden and William	16
Chapter 2 Hunsden and Frances	23
2-1 A Character of Frances and Her Relations with William	23
2-2 Relations between Hunsden and Frances	31
Chapter 3 Hunsden and Victor	38
3-1 William and Frances's Reaction to Victor	38
3-2 Relations between Hunsden and Victor	39
Chapter 4 Hunsden's Elements in Brontë's Later Novels	43
4-1 <i>Jane Eyre</i>	43
4-2 <i>Villette</i>	46
Conclusion	50
Bibliography	53

Introduction

The Professor (1857) was the first novel written by Charlotte Brontë (1816–1855), but since Brontë completed the work, it has not been rated highly. It was brought to publishing companies in 1846, but only *Wuthering Heights* (1847) and *Agnes Grey* (1847), novels by Charlotte's sisters Emily and Anne, respectively, which were also brought, were published. *The Professor* was criticized bitterly: “‘it was deficient in startling incident’ and ‘thrilling excitement’ and therefore ‘would never suit the circulating libraries’” (Gerin 313), and it was rejected for publication. Afterward, *Jane Eyre* (1848) instantly became a best-seller, and Charlotte established her flourishing position as a writer. Nevertheless, she did not give up on the idea of publishing *The Professor*, and her last revision of *The Professor* was completed around 1850 after *Jane Eyre* and *Shirley* (1849) were published (Aoyama 56). Charlotte wrote of her strong thoughts about *The Professor* to W. S. Williams in 1847:

I found the beginning very feeble, the whole narrative deficient in incident and in general attractiveness; yet the middle and later portion of the work, all that relates to Brussels, the Belgian school &c. is as good as I can write; it contains more pith, more substance, more reality, in my judgement, than much of “Jane Eyre.” It gives, I think, a new view of a grade, an occupation, and a class of characters—all very common-place, very insignificant in themselves, but not more so than the materials composing that portion of “Jane Eyre” which seems to please most generally—.

My wish is to recast “the Professor,” add as well as I can, what is deficient,

retrench some parts, develop others. . . . (*Letters* 1.574)

While her prayers were not answered during her lifetime, *The Professor* was published posthumously with *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* by Elizabeth Gaskell (1810–1865) in 1857. Regarding the criticism at that time, however, Malone summarized this:

Critics were more interested in the drama of the *Life* than ... *The Professor*, and those critics who did pronounce upon the novel invariably did so in the light of the biography, endeavouring to equate the characters with those in Brontë's life or at best, with her later literary creations: (Malone 176–77)

Readers' interests were linked with *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*, and subsequently, *The Professor* was read in connection with Gaskell's publication and Charlotte's late works. There have been few evaluations of the content of the novel. Moreover, we can see much criticism of its expression, and not for the story. Critics have argued that it is more unnatural than Charlotte's other later novels because she used a male narrator, unlike her other novels, and because it was the first novel she devoted to realism. However, it seems inappropriate to undervalue this novel because of its unnaturalness and artlessness.

In *The Professor*, the parentless William Crimsworth leaves his aristocratic uncles after graduation and becomes a clerk in the office of his cruel brother Edward. William is treated as a slave by Edward, so he escapes to Belgium and becomes a teacher. After that, he marries his beloved wife, Frances Evans Henri, they build a school, make a fortune, and return to England with their son, Victor, in triumph. Therefore, this story seems to be a Bildungsroman, a popular type of novel in the 19th century. In the case of

William, however, it seems to be different from a typical Bildungsroman, for he seems to be able to succeed in life thanks to “Circumstances” (37) and not by his positive action. The person who creates the “Circumstances” behind the scenes is Yorke Hunsden, a businessperson William meets when he works at Edward’s office. Hunsden helps William escape from Edward’s tyranny and decides to go to Belgium, introduces William to his acquaintance there, advises William on financing and running a school, and provides other forms of assistance to William. Moreover, he also influences Frances and Victor. He has a strong influence on the protagonist and his family, and in this way, Hunsden is the key figure of this story. Nevertheless, until now, there has been little research on *The Professor* on which Hunsden is centered, as most critics tend to mention him in relation to the main characters in a few chapters. For instance, Maynard, who studies sexuality in Brontë’s works, considers Hunsden as follows:

What Brontë suggests is the temporary dominance of a friendly man who serves as a generally positive father figure and role model to Crimsworth, even eliciting his assertion of independence by teasing him with his dependent role. . . . In their future relations, Hunsden will be not a father figure but an equal male voice, challenging Crimsworth’s view of himself and his world and offering the reader a different perspective from the narrator’s. (Maynard 78–79)

Hunsden helps to release William from Edward, however, he informs other people about Edward’s cruelty, and leads them to jeer at Edward “at a public meeting in the Town-hall” (36). Thus, it seems too simple to call this a fatherly attitude. Moreover, although he visits many foreign countries for travel, Hunsden does not work in Belgium, so that he is not a

role model for William simply by visiting Belgium. Furthermore, William and Hunsden seem to be opposed to each other not because Hunsden has opposing opinions about William but because William is discontented with the fact that Hunsden sees William's interior thoughts. Accordingly, arguing that Hunsden's only role is to provide readers with other points of view against William is inadequate. For example, Gilbert and Gubar have a different opinion about Hunsden:

Is there any reason for this unfriendly friendship and why does Brontë dramatize it in both the beginning and ending sections of *The Professor*? What comes close to suggesting an explanation is the increasingly obvious parallel between Hunsden's bitterness and (in the beginning) Crimsworth's bitterness, between Hunsden's rebelliousness and (later) Frances's or Victor's rebelliousness. Hunsden, it begins to seem, incarnates much of the disaffection in *The Professor*: he is an involuntary image . . . of the anger in Charlotte Brontë's own mind. (Gilbert and Gubar 332)

Considering his dissatisfaction with England, and that he has a strong influence on William, Frances, and Victor, this opinion seems more convincing. Betsinger says about *The Professor* that "Informed by her [Brontë] private reading of the Genesis Fall Myth, *The Professor* presents her new hero, 'Adam's Son', her new heroine, Eve's Daughter, and her serpent" (Betsinger 101) and regarded Hunsden as a "serpent". She indicates that "in her novel, the tempter's reason for being is to encourage and goad Adam's Son to wider and more refined humanity by assisting in his present discomfort but eventual growth and ultimate good" (106). While William succeeds in his position, of course, it

could not be said that his humanity becomes “wider and more refined” in this story. However, Hunsden is indeed well related to William’s “eventual growth and ultimate good” through his assistance, so from this point of view, Hunsden has a similar role as the serpent who gives Adam and Eve a chance to move to the new world. Moreover, Amano, who researches *The Professor* in respect of a travel sketch, regards Hunsden as a person who has the ambition to exceed social customs and classes by himself, but cannot do that in practice; therefore, he goes on a journey of searching human’s possibilities and shakes up other characters’ values to expand their views as a catalyst (Amano 69). As to classes, it seems that he has already exceeded, since he works as a businessperson while he was born in an aristocratic family. However, as to social customs, he cannot cross the border by himself, and considering his influences on William, Frances, and Victor, this opinion seems to be much to the point. In summary, Hunsden does not just provide other points of view as a male character of the same generation as the protagonist, but also provides important movements in the story and projects the suppressed passion of each main character. Consequently, he plays an important role not only in *The Professor*, but also in Brontë’s other later works.

This thesis focuses on Hunsden by centering on his character, his influence on William, Frances, and Victor as a catalyst, and what he brings to this story as a result. By examining how Hunsden’s role is connected to Charlotte Brontë’s later works, especially *Jane Eyre* and *Villette*, *The Professor*, which has been criticized more than Charlotte’s later works, can be reevaluated.

Chapter 1 Hunsden and William

1-1 Hunsden's Character

Hunsden is not only a mill owner but also a businessperson. Additionally, he was born into a family with a long aristocratic history. Subsequently, he has two irreconcilable, simultaneous positions as a person of aristocratic descent and a successful businessperson. As to his appearance, at their first meeting, William explains this as follows:

I know not what it was in Mr. Hunsden that, as I watched him . . . suggested to me, every now and then, the idea of a foreigner. In form and features, he might be pronounced English—though even there one caught a dash of something Gallic—but he had no English shyness. . . . Refinement, he did not affect, yet vulgar, he could not be called; he was not odd—no quiz—yet he resembled no one else I had ever seen before; (24)

William notices that Hunsden has several elements, including features of being “English” and “a foreigner,” and he could not categorize Hunsden’s appearance with his knowledge. Moreover, when William visited Hunsden’s house a few days later, he noticed other points in Hunsden’s appearance:

I was surprised now, on examination, to perceive how small and even feminine were his lineaments, his tall figure, long and dark locks, his voice and general bearing had impressed me with the notion of something powerful and massive; not at all . . . character had set a stamp upon each, expression recast them at her pleasure—and strange metamorphoses she wrought, giving him now the mien of

a morose bull and anon that of arch and mischievous girl; more frequently, the two semblances were blent, and a queer, composite countenance they made. (29; my underlines)

In his appearance, Hunsden is a hermaphrodite with both masculine and feminine elements. This suggests that Hunsden can understand and sympathize with both William and Frances through this story. From the artwork (Fig. 1) created by Arthur H. Buckland, when he approaches a girl as a gentleman, we can see both male and feminine elements in his lineament. Shuttleworth points out that Hunsden's ambivalent position is indicated in the location of his house in "X—shire": "Hunsden's house, which, in keeping with his ambivalent social and sexual status, is situated in liminal territory, on the border between country and city, nature, and manufacture, provides the site of seduction" (Shuttleworth 130–31). It is also depicted in his house in "——shire," where he lives at the end of the story "thirty miles separated from X—" shire (215), is connected to the house in which William's family live called Daisy-Lane. Although the house is depicted as "a very old mansion, one of the Elizabethan structures" (215), his guests "are often foreigners" (216), and give "a metropolitan, almost a cosmopolitan freedom and largeness to the Talk" (217). His houses show his ambivalent position.



A.G.

Page 218

H

Fig. 1 Hunsden applies his hand for the fine girl at Edward's birthday party (Buckland 218)

Hunsden had a negative view of British society at that time. Answering Frances' question about England, he calls his country "that dirty little country called England" so cynically that she who longs for England becomes confused:

"England is your country?" asked Frances.

"Yes."

"And you don't like it?"

"I'd be sorry to like it! A little corrupt, venal, lord-and-king-cursed nation, full of mucky pride (as they say in ——shire) and helpless pauperism; rotten with abuses, worm-eaten with prejudices!"

"You might say so of almost every state; there are abuses and prejudices everywhere, and I thought fewer in England than in other countries."

"Come to England and see. Come to Birmingham and Manchester, come to St. Giles in London and get a practical notion of how our system works. Examine the foot-prints of our august aristocracy—see how they walk in blood, crushing hearts as they go. Just put your head in at English cottage doors, get a glimpse of Famine crouched torpid on black hearth-stones; of Disease lying bare on beds without coverlets; of Infamy wantoning viciously with Ignorance, though indeed Luxury is her favourite paramour and princely halls are dearer to her than thatched hovels—" (197–98)

What he says here seems sarcastic, but this was the reality of England at that time. Brontë must have felt these negative aspects of British society in her life. As "abuses" and "prejudices," for instance, she had experienced in her job as a governess. At that time,

middle-class women must have become teachers or governesses if they need to earn their living. Although an employer and an employee's classes are usually almost the same, governesses tended to be mocked by their employers. Brontë complained about her employer's wife to her sister Emily on 8th June 1839:

I said in my last letter that Mrs. Sidgwick did not know me. I now begin to find that she does not intend to know me. . . . [I used to think I should like to be in the stir of grand folks' society. . . .] I see now more clearly than I ever done before that a private governess has no existence, is not considered as a living and rational being except as connected with the wearisome duties she has to fulfill. While she is teaching the children, working for them, amusing them, it is alright. . . . Nevertheless, Mrs. Sidgwick is universally considered an amiable woman. (*Letters* 1.191)

She plainly showed her displeasure for Mrs. Sidgwick and was concerned by the fact such treatment for governesses is usual. She had worked there for only two months and took up this problem in her works. In *The Professor*, the governess and the tutor are used as a metaphor to express William's loneliness and solitariness at Edward's birthday party (20). Brontë then represents the governess more in *Jane Eyre* and *Shirley*, too. In *Shirley*, Brontë also took up Luddite risings and class conflicts in Yorkshire. As Thormählen and Wood notice that both *Shirley* and *The Professor* show "the vulnerability of the manufacturer to sudden changes in the terms of trade and production" in the depiction of works in mills (Thormählen and Wood 280). In *The Professor*, it is depicted in only Edward's mill, but in *Shirley*, Brontë expanded this topic for the whole story.

Furthermore, “Famine” was also a serious problem at that time. This story starts before the “railroads were not then in existence” (8), therefore, it must be between about 1830-1840. According to Black, in the Victorian age, “The rich lived lavishly, indeed grossly, catered for by French-trained chefs,” “had various costly luxuries and more imported foods and wines,” but farmers and country laborers needed to live frugally. “Strong tea, giving an illusion of warmth and fullness, was the main comfort of both rural and urban poor” (Black 266–67). When *The Professor* is written, the situation got so worse that the age called the Hungry Forties. As Uda suggests, Brontë experienced a lot of kinds of meals; the plain one in their home, the one in London, at her workplace as a governess, on her journey, and in foreign countries (Uda 21). She also had had wretched meals in Cowan Bridge School, where an outbreak of typhoid fever had happened due to its unsanitary conditions, and her sisters Maria and Elizabeth got ill and died. Thus, Brontë must have felt the gaps in England painfully.

In this story, there is no depiction of “Famine” in detail, but William must experience the actual situation of the industry at least. As Avely suggests, “Rejecting the industrial north” and “a world condemned as being founded upon mammon-worship and systems of oppression that eradicate nature and liberty,” William moves to Belgium and becomes a teacher (Avely 264). However, William never explained these aspects of England to Frances, who longed to go there. Hunsden projects the problems in their home country that Brontë worried about but the other characters, especially William, do not explain clearly.

Although he is of noble birth, he makes a living by being a businessperson. Additionally, he has a hermaphrodite appearance, and his house is on a boundary line between city and country, an industrial zone, and rural areas. Moreover, he plainly shows

problems and dissatisfaction in England which the author felt. This is Hunsden's ambivalence and detachment from the class society and patriarchy of England. Furthermore, William notices Hunsden's "incompatibilities" that "I discerned that there would be contrasts between his inward and outward man, connections too, for I suspected his soul had more of will and ambition, than his body had of fibre and muscle. . . . he *would* but *could* not . . ." (29; italics in original). What "will" and "ambition" he "*would* but *could* not" is, as we see in the Introduction, Amano indicates that to exceed social customs and classes by himself (Amano 69). Although he has ambivalence and shakes others' views by his sarcastic attitude, he cannot break the frame by himself; for example, as discussed later, he cannot choose the lady who has a strong passion and ambition as his wife. Therefore, it can be said that he decides to stimulate others to seek human's possibility. As a result of his "will and ambition" turning these eyes toward other characters, there are a lot of whirling movements in this story.

1-2 William's Character

The narrator of this story is William, and therefore, his character is only revealed from his subjective narrative. In other words, William presents information about his character and makes readers consider him through his thoughts. There are two main distinguishing features of his character that we can read from his narrative; a person who is mentally and intellectually superior, and a person who can control themselves. These two insistences are emphasized through comparisons with other characters. For instance, when William meets Edward for the first time, he compares his own frame with Edward's: "I measured his [Edward's] robust frame and powerful proportions. . . . In face, I resembled him, though I was not so handsome—my features were less regular. . . . As an animal, Edward

excelled me far” (14; my underlines). Through this, he indicates that he sees himself as inferior to Edward. However, what is important is that he says “As an animal” as an introductory remark. Even though he is physically inferior, William intimates that he is superior to Edward as a human being. Second, we can see that he is a person who can control himself in the conversation with his employer, Pelet. This is the scene in which William is asked about Middle Reuter and her students by Pelet:

. . . but I now felt plainly that my principal [Pelet] was endeavouring . . . to excite ideas and wishes in my mind alien to what was right and honourable. The iniquity of the instigation proved its antidote and when he further added:

“Each of those three beautiful girls will have a handsome fortune, and with a little address, a gentlemanlike, intelligent young fellow like you might make himself master of the hand, heart and purse of any one of the trio,” I replied by a look and an interrogative “Monsieur?” which startled him. (80)

William discusses having “ideas and wishes” about being in love with or marrying students that Pelet describes as “alien to what was right and honourable” and tells readers that he responds to Pelet resolutely. William regards having romantic feelings for or a desire to marry students as unreasonable and asserts himself as a self-controlled man who resolutely refuses his employer’s tempting words.

However, although William insists that he is self-controlled, he clearly demonstrates interest in women. When William is invited to Edward’s birthday party, no one cares about him, and William says, “I should have liked well enough to be introduced to some pleasing and intelligent girl and to have the opportunity to show that I could both feel and

communicate the pleasure of social intercourse” (20). Through this, he demonstrates his wish to be acquainted with women. Even then, he waits for “Circumstances”—he cannot talk to women by himself. After moving to Belgium and starting work at Pelet’s pensionnat, he notices that the other side of a shattered window in his room is the women’s pensionnat. He thinks that “it would have been . . . so amusing to have watched the demoiselles at their play—to have studied female character in a variety of phases” (54–55) and is excited to imagine watching women from the window. However, even here, his wish is limited to watching them; he does not mention a closer relationship. Afterward, he is employed in the women’s pensionnat, and when he goes to see Mdlle. Reuter, the directress, for the first time, he is worried about whether he should wear good clothes. Finally, he concludes that “I am not handsome, and no dressing can make me so” (64) and decides to wear his normal clothes. He continues to explain that he has a complex about his appearance and considers himself unloved by women.

Nevertheless, he is unable to hide his longing for women. For instance, in one scene, William plays the gentleman to Mdlle. Reuters to court her favor (67). Moreover, when he first stands at a podium in the womens’ pensionnat, he “was dazzled,” his “eyes fell, and in a voice somewhat too low,” he “murmured”, demonstrating his restlessness in an obvious way and causing three girls sitting in the first row who are leaders in this class to laugh at him (70). While William has a sense of inferiority and cannot be active, at the same time, he has a longing for women and a wish to be loved by them.

As we saw in the Introduction, William only responds to “Circumstances” (37). Even with his ideas for the future, he does not have a drive from the beginning but changes depending on the circumstances. At first, when he is asked what his plan is after he graduates from Eton and leaves his relatives and his uncle, he decides to become a

tradesperson on that occasion, although he “had had no thoughts of the sort” (6):

I do not think that my turn of mind qualifies me to make a good tradesman—my taste, my ambition does not lie that way, but such was the scorn expressed in Lord Tynedale’s countenance as he pronounced the word *Trade*, such the contemptuous sarcasm of his tone, that I was instantly decided. My father was but a name to me—yet that name I did not like to hear mentioned with a sneer to my very face: I answered then, with haste and warmth, “I cannot do better than follow in my father’s steps—yes—I will be a tradesman.” (6; italics in original).

It is evident that William decides to become a tradesperson only because it is irritating for him to hear his father’s occupation being insulted by his uncle. As to the decision to go to Belgium, nevertheless, he first has this idea when Hunsden suggests it, and he decides and prepares for it there and then. William is not driven to reach a goal but changes what to do by judging the circumstances. Finally, the goal he begins to have for the future is to have a higher position and a home. This aspiration descends on him and is accompanied by pain in a conversation with Frances:

And as I spoke, a pang, new to me, shot across my heart: it was a pang of mortification at the humility of my position and the inadequacy of my means; while with that pang was born a strong desire to do more, earn more, be more, possess more; and in the increased possessions, my roused and eager spirit panted to include the home I had never had, the wife I inwardly vowed to win. (145–46)

He is seized by “a pang, ashamed of his deficient position and fortune.” From this pang, “a strong desire” to reach a much higher place, and “roused and eager spirit” to get “the home” he “had never had,” and “the wife,” that is, Frances, is born in his mind. It should be noticed that he uses the word “win” to get Frances as his wife. In this scene, William aims to be an ideal patriarch with a higher position, good fortune, and wife. He begins to search for a job to reach this goal after that, and finally, he “wins” Frances as his wife, obtains a stable fortune, and makes an ideal home. Consequently, William becomes the patriarch in this story.

1-3 Relations between Hunsden and William

Mostly, William feels hatred toward Hunsden because he always penetrates William’s inward thoughts and thrusts them before William. William tends to hide his character from others; when he does not want it to be read, he often uses the word “visor” (17, 72) to show his protection. As Oshimoto notices, William is always “guarded by three faculties; Caution, Tact, Observation” (26), and it is his way of living (Oshimoto 55)—but they do not affect Hunsden. This is the main reason why William does not send letters or ask for help from Hunsden of his own will. For instance, Hunsden penetrates the truth about William’s feelings toward Middle Reuter, although he is not at the scene. Let us begin with a scene in which William and Middle Reuter walk in the garden together:

. . . I gave my arm to Middle Reuter and led her to a garden-chair, nestled under some lilacs near. She sat down, I took my place at her side; she went on talking to me with that ease which communicates ease and, as I listened, a revelation dawned in my mind that I was on the brink of falling in love. (89; my underlines)

William clearly indicates his feelings toward Mdlle. Reuter using the word “love.” However, he changes his mind when he overhears the conversation between Pelet and Mdlle. Reuters and happens to know of their engagement:

“What do you say François [Pelet]? Do you say Crimsworth is in love with me?”

“Over head and ears.”

“Has he told you so?”

“No—but I see it in his face—he blushes whenever your name is mentioned.”

A little laugh of exulting coquetry announced Mdlle. Reuter’s gratification at this piece of intelligence (which was a lie, by the bye, I had never been so far gone as that, after all). (92; my underlines)

This story is entirely narrated from William’s perspective; therefore, we cannot judge whether he blushes when he is with Mdlle. Reuter. However, considering he does not have very much experience with women, it is highly possible that he unconsciously blushes. Afterward, during his stay in Belgium, Hunsden visits William to see if the rumors of William and Mdlle. Reuter being in love are true. William confidently explains to Hunsden that she married Pelet, and William himself is not shocked by it. However, Hunsden retorts William as follows:

“. . . if you took no particular interest in Miss Zoraïde—why, O youthful pedagogue! did you leave your place in consequence of her becoming Madame

Pelet?”

“Because—” I felt my face grow a little hot; “because—in short, Mr. Hunsden, I decline answering any more questions.” And I plunged my hands deep in my breeches pocket.

Hunsden triumphed—his eyes—his laugh announced victory. (170; my underlines)

William’s reaction clearly shows that Hunsden penetrates the fact. Before that, William mentions staying at Pelet’s school even after their marriage that, “if I stayed, the probability was that in three months’ time, a practical Modern French novel would be in full process of concoction,” with the preliminary remark that he is not a “pope” and cannot be proud of “infallibility” (157), implying the possibility of having an affair with Mdlle. Reuter. Here, he talks about the danger of living together under one roof, assuming that Mdlle. Reuter is attracted to him, not to his feelings for her. Evidently, he loved her in the past, and therefore, it seems that he must say rather “I was attracted to her, so if she has her fancy for me, I may succumb to her temptation” than “She is attracted to me, so if there is an opportunity, I may succumb to her temptation.” Hunsden exposes William’s deception of self-justification in his first-person narrative.

Hunsden intervenes in William’s life on his own initiative, but William indicates displeasure. The first incident caused by Hunsden’s intervention is a disconnection with Edward. Being insulted by Hunsden and others at the town hall meeting, Edward becomes incensed and blames William for stirring up Hunsden the next day:

“—I detected you in close conversation with Hunsden at my house a month ago

and I know that you were at Hunsden's rooms last night. Deny it if you dare."

"Oh I shall not deny it! and if Hunsden hounded on the people to hiss you, he did quite right—you deserve popular execration for a worse man, a harder master, a more brutal brother than you are has seldom existed."

"Sirrah! Sirrah!" reiterated Crimsworth, and to complete his apostrophe, he cracked the whip straight over my head.

A minute sufficed to wrest it from him, break it in two pieces and throw it under the grate; he made a head long rush at me, which I evaded and said:

"Touch me and I'll have you up before the nearest magistrate." (36)

As Minamoto points out, although there are no words like "passion" and others equivalent to that in this scene, readers can feel William's "passion" sufficiently because William says that he feels "the stir and tumult" so much that it makes his appetite vanish, and "I only thought of walking that the action of my muscles might harmonize with the action of my nerves" (37) (Minamoto 222). This demonstrates an emotional conflict between Edward, who becomes passionate openly, and William, who only expresses his passion for a short time and then immediately suppresses it. The fact that Edward fails in business and starts to use violence against his wife afterward supplies evidence that those who fail to control passion cannot succeed in business, and so, William attempts to control his passion to attain the image of an ideal man judged favorably by the Victorian age (Minamoto 222). Consequently, William moves closer to the image of an ideal man. After this scene, Hunsden comes to William's room, and William hears details from Hunsden. Although William says Hunsden's conflict with Edward is "quite right" (36) and inwardly admits that "In fact, I was grateful, or almost so," he dares not show his gratitude to

Hunsden with an excuse that “human nature is perverse” (41).

At that time, William seemed to take delight in Hunsden’s reaction by avoiding expressing his gratitude, but his antipathy toward Hunsden became stronger at the end of the story. It is depicted appropriately in the scene in which the portrait of William’s mother, thought to have been sold somewhere due to Edward’s bankruptcy, was sent to him by Hunsden:

A listener (had there been one) might have heard me after ten minutes’ silent gazing, utter the word “Mother!” I might have said more. . . . I took the note from its niche; thus it spoke:

“There is a sort of stupid pleasure in giving a child sweets, a fool his bells, a dog a bone. You are repaid by seeing the child besmear his face with sugar; by witnessing how the fool’s ecstasy makes a greater fool of him than ever; by watching the dog’s nature come out over his bone. In giving William Crimsworth his Mother’s picture, I give him sweets, bells, and bone, all in one. . . . H.Y.H. . . .”

I muffled the picture in its green baize covering, restored it to the case, and having transported the whole concern to my bedroom, put it out of sight under my bed. My pleasure was now poisoned by pungent pain; (175–76; my underlines)

Hunsden depicts William’s figure of the time when he receives the portrait as “a child,” “a fool,” and even “a dog” in his note; it is difficult to say that these metaphors are rational. Hunsden realizes that William has been fascinated by the portrait since his first encounter in front of it at Crimsworth Hall, Edward’s house. Therefore, he can forecast how William will react after he buys it back and sends it to William. He indeed bears in mind William’s

feelings, of course, but William feels displeasure and “put it out of sight.” While it never appears in this novel after that, through this event, William becomes independent of his mother. Therefore, Hunsden creates a chance for his growth in the same way as the suggestion for going to Belgium.

As evident, Hunsden understands William well and plays the role like a mirror reflecting William’s inward thoughts. As to the scenes of their conversations, William describes that “he [Hunsden] wheeled his chair round to the table so as to be opposite me” (40; my underlines), and “I was sitting in the window-seat, with my back to the light, and I had *him vis-à-vis*” (167; italics in original, my underlines). We can see from these examples that they always talk face-to-face. This description gives the impression that they are reflected in a mirror. He reflects William’s sexual desire for women, longing for mothers, and so on; these are the emotions that need to be restricted to be successful in the patriarchy. Hunsden plays a role in exposing these suppressed emotions in the patriarchy as a catalyst.

Nevertheless, although he receives a large amount of help from Hunsden, William does not regard Hunsden as a friend or supporter and never expresses his gratitude. The main reason for this attitude is that Hunsden is contrary to the standard that crosses the border of gender and class, and he penetrates William’s inner side and points out that William is trying to hide. It is not an exaggeration to say that Hunsden’s hermaphroditic attitude, which is too meddlesome and rides roughshod over William’s feelings, has a homosexual aspect rather than a friendly one. Furthermore, being penetrated by and confronted with hidden facts and thoughts, proud William must be offended. In either event, for William, aiming at success in the patriarchy, Hunsden is nothing other than a hazardous element. However, William does not try to cut his ties to Hunsden; they live

near after William and his family move to England, even though he expresses his unpleasant feelings, and his attitude toward Hunsden is practical.

Chapter 2 Hunsden and Frances

2-1 Frances and Her Relations with William

Frances' physical features stand out through the contrast between her employer, Mdlle. Reuter, who is "a little and roundly formed woman" and has a "freshness of complexion" (66). Mdlle. Reuter is depicted as a woman who has the feminine attractiveness of that time. Moreover, she says about the male predominance that "Men have so much more influence than women have, they argue so much more logically than we do" (107), and about the state of women that "I think, Monsieur—it appears to me that ambition—*literary* ambition especially, is not a feeling to be cherished in the mind of a woman" (125; italics in original). She personifies the ideal woman at the time when women had a lower social position than men and could not have a career. According to the explanatory notes in the Oxford University Press version of *The Professor* (252), these words are thought to be based on a letter Brontë received from Robert Southey when she asked him for advice about her poetry: "Literature cannot be the business of a woman's life, and it ought not to be. The more she is engaged in her proper duties, the less leisure will she have for it, even as an accomplishment and a recreation" (Gaskell 125). Brontë had Mdlle. Reuter, the opponent to the hero, say these words to have readers think that these words are unreasonable.

In contrast, Frances is "not so rounded" (102) and "her complexion" is "colourless" (123). As a woman who did not have the feminine attractiveness of that time, she was quite contrary to Mdlle. Reuter. Added to this, she takes William's classes with a "*literary* ambition" that "is not a feeling to be cherished in the mind of a woman" in Mdlle. Reuter's words. William acknowledges her literary talents, and when he praises her *devoir*, he "saw the sun had dissevered its screening cloud, her countenance was transfigured, a

smile shone in her eyes—a smile almost triumphant” (114). She feels appreciated when her work is acknowledged. In this respect, Frances was not a desirable lady at that time.

After getting married, William speaks about her character that “she was a curious mixture of tractability and firmness” (207). Frances’ answer to the question that William asks about what she would do if she got married to “a profligate, a prodigal, a drunkard, or a tyrant” (213) is given below:

“Monsieur, if a wife’s nature loathes that of the man she is wedded to, marriage must be slavery. Against slavery, all right thinkers revolt—and though torture be the price of resistance, torture must be dared; though the only road to freedom lie through the gates of Death—those gates must be passed, for freedom is indispensable. Then, Monsieur, I would resist as far as my strength permitted; when that strength failed, I should be sure of a refuge; Death would certainly screen me both from bad laws and their consequences.”

“Voluntary death, Frances?”

“No, Monsieur—I’d have courage to live out every throe of anguish Fate assigned me and principle to contend for Justice and Liberty to the last.” (213–14; my underlines)

Through this example of her insistence, we can see her enthusiastic attitude toward “freedom,” “Justice” and “Liberty,” and her energetic passion. This insistence is also similar to what Brontë wrote about marriage in her letter to Ellen Nussey, her friend, on 15th May 1840: “Do not be over-persuaded to marry a man you can never respect—I do not say love because, I think, if you can respect a person before marriage, moderate love

at least will come after” (*Letters* 1. 217–18; underlines in original). Brontë insisted that women must get married someone who they can respect, and made Frances claim this opinion.

Before considering her relationship with Hunsden, it is necessary to look at that with William, her husband. Frances is completely different from other protagonists of Brontë’s later novels because, through her relations with William, she finally comes under the rule of a male-dominated society. At first, she says that “I will go and live in England—I will teach French there” (119); her final objective is to be a French teacher in England. Although William suggests that she should quit her job after their marriage, she is opposed to William by saying, “we shall have both the same profession—I like that—” (188) and “I like a contemplative life, but I like an active life better; I must act in some way and act with you” (189). Frances persists in continuing to work on decisions. Finally, however, when she proposes her plan to build their school, she explains “her hopes for the future” that “If we only had good health and tolerable success, we might . . . in time realize an independency, and that, perhaps, we were too old to enjoy it; then both she and I would rest, and what was to hinder us from going to live in England?” (208). In conclusion, she loses her initial ambition to become a teacher in England. Amano presumes the reasons why she decides to rest. First, Frances wants to spend plenty of time traveling around England where she has longed to go for a long time. Second, she might predict the danger of life seeking an upper social position and being a slave of mammon. Consequently, she might choose rather an education only for her own child than students in school and change her field to progress in her life (Amano 68). There are no depictions of her change in mental state in “years of bustle, action, unslacked endeavour” for operating their school (208), so we cannot assume the truth. The first one might be true,

because she “always” looks “to England as” her “Canaan.” However, the second one could not be true because she does not seek upper positions and a lot of money when she decides to build a school—she wants to have “important duties,” and “exciting, absorbing, profitable work,” for “she was not one who could live quiescent and inactive or ever comparatively inactive,” as William says (208). Therefore, it seems wrong to say her choice to be rest and educate her child at home is positive one.

We need to consider her process of losing ambition. Azim, who discusses the association between William’s Englishness and colonial rule, considers Frances as follows:

Her duality of nationality is used to magnify her anomalous nature: the Anglo-Swiss woman belongs to neither nation, linguistically or culturally, and the fluidity of her status is used to establish the triumph and superiority of the central male English narrator, as she is gradually transformed into an English woman.
(Azim 149)

While Frances was born to a Swiss father and an English mother, she lives in Belgium and uses French as her mother tongue. Azim points out that the process of Frances becoming an English lady by William is depicted in this story. Frances does not offend his dominance; rather, she insists on a relationship between the master and pupil. When William teaches her as a teacher, he says about her attitude toward William:

. . . I installed myself in her place, allowing her to stand deferentially at my side, for I esteemed it wise and right in her case to enforce strictly all forms ordinarily

in use between master and pupil; the rather because I perceived that in proportion as my manner grew austere and magisterial, hers became easy and self-possessed; (115)

William notices that the more William becomes “austere and magisterial,” the more Frances becomes “easy and self-possessed.” We can see from this depiction that Frances is not displeased by being dominated by men. In portraying William and Frances, Buckland seems to emphasize that William is superior to Frances in their relationship (Fig. 2). Even after getting married, she attempts to maintain this relationship with him. Although William tells her to call him by his name, “William,” she refuses and says, “I cannot pronounce your W.; besides, Monsieur belongs to you; I like it best” (207). On this topic, Frances is not obedient. On the contrary, William starts to call her “Frances” after his marriage proposal and stops calling her “Mademoiselle.” Unless Frances changes and calls him William, the unequal relationship is maintained. As Amano points out, Frances might keep her identity and independence, and support William as her master at the same time by calling William “Monsieur” (Amano 69).



Fig. 2. William and Frances in Frances's house (Buckland 349)

Still, her passion for seeking independent freedom is not vanquished. After they are married and have built their school, William says about Frances that “So different was she under different circumstances I seemed to possess two wives” (209), indicating her two-facedness. Frances, teaching at the school in the daytime, is mentioned as follows:

In the daytime my house and establishment were conducted by Madame the Directress, a stately and elegant woman, bearing much anxious thought on her large brow . . . she then appeared vigilant and solicitous. When communicating instruction her aspect was more animated; she seemed to feel a certain enjoyment in the occupation. (209; my underlines)

Frances working as “Madame the Directress,” is depicted as “vigilant and solicitous,” and her feature is seen as “animated,” therefore, she is satisfied with this job and enjoys it. However, Frances at night after the job is depicted differently:

At six o’clock p.m., my daily labours ceased—I then came home, for my home was my heaven—ever at that hour, as I entered our private-sitting-room—the lady directress vanished from before my eyes, and Frances Henri, my own little lace-mender, was magically restored to my arms; (211; my underlines)

William explains that not “the lady directress” but a “little lace-mender” comes back to him; through this explanation, we can assume that when she is not working, Frances is the same as when she first met William and was his student. Besides, William recognizes her as “Frances Henri” only at that time and the home where Frances is as “my heaven.”

As an ideal patriarch, William loves Frances as an angel in the house. Frances was satisfied with this recognition and demonstrates this in a scene in which she talks to William soon after she expresses her opinion about marriage and freedom:

“I should have been though but for my master—I should never have suited any man but Professor Crimsworth—. . . . Now I have been Professor Crimsworth’s wife eight years and what is he in my eyes? is he honourable, beloved—?” She stopped, her voice was cut off—her eyes suddenly suffused. . . . she threw her arms round me and strained me to her heart with passionate earnestness: the energy of her whole being glowed in her dark and then dilated eye, and crimsoned her animated cheek; her look and movement were like inspiration; in one, there was such a flash, in the other such a power.

Half an hour afterwards, when she had become calm, I asked where all that wild vigour was gone, which had transformed her erewhile and made her glance so thrilling and ardent; her action so rapid and strong. She looked down smiling softly and passively:

“I cannot tell where it is gone, Monsieur,” said she; “but I know that whenever it is wanted it will come back again.” (214; my underlines)

Words like “passionate” and “energy” clarify that Frances exposes her love to William with passion. Nevertheless, she regards William as her “master” and “professor.” Frances loves William as “Professor Crimsworth.” As demonstrated in 1-2, William explains that having romantic feelings toward his students is immoral, and he maintains this attitude even toward Frances. Subsequently, they maintain their professor-pupil relationship even

after their marriage. This exposure of passion gradually calms down, and her countenance changes to become “softly and passively.” Although William asks, “where all that wild vigour was gone,” she only answers, “I know that whenever it is wanted it will come back again.” However, the story does not return to this, and her passion gradually calms down after this scene.

Before the above quotation (214), William mentions the exposure of her passion: “the display of eccentric vigour never gave her pleasure, and it only sounded in her voice or flashed in her countenance when extraordinary circumstances, and those generally painful, forced it out of the depths when it burned latent” (199). In this situation, she expresses her strong devotion to William, however, this seems not to be “extraordinary circumstances, and those generally painful.” Even in a quarrel with Hunsden, as we shall see later, Frances changes her attitude in front of William and seems to not suffer from a guilty conscience or displeasure about exposing her passion. Therefore, it is possible that William’s reading of the circumstances in which Frances’s “display of eccentric vigour” appears to be his misunderstanding. Frances is not obliged to express their passion when they are driven into a corner. Her passion is derived both from a rebellious spirit against the obstruction for freedom to live without being bound by a male-dominated society and a submissive desire to be loved by her admirable professor and live with him. In this way, two conflicting emotions, rebellion and submission, coexist in Frances.

2-2 Relations between Hunsden and Frances

Hunsden is the very person who brings out a passion that Frances has suppressed in relation to William. At their first meeting, their conversation continues in a warm tone. When their topic moves to England, Frances becomes “Animated by degrees . . . just as

a grave night-sky changes at the approach of sunrise” (196). She urges him “with an enthusiasm of curiosity,” and her attitude makes Hunsden relaxed, “as fire thaws a congealed viper.” William mentions to them that “he” is “himself,” and “Frances” is “herself” at that time (197). In this scene, there is an affinity between them. However, when Hunsden criticizes Switzerland, Frances quarrels with him. This was the beginning of the quarrel.

“Since England is nothing—why do the continental nations respect her so?”

. . . “if you had been my pupil . . . I would have put you in the corner for such a confession or ignorance. Why, Mademoiselle, can’t you see that it is our *gold* which buys us French politeness, German good-will and Swiss servility?” And he sneered diabolically.

“Swiss!” said Frances, catching the word. “Servility! Do you call my countrymen servile?” And she started up; I could not suppress a low laugh; there was ire in her glance and defiance in her attitude. “Do you abuse Switzerland to me, Mr. Hunsden? Do you think I have no associations? Do you calculate that I am prepared to dwell only on what vice and degradation may be found in Alpine villages, and to leave quite out of my heart the social greatness of my countrymen and our blood-earned freedom and the natural glories of our Mountains? You’re mistaken—you’re mistaken—” (199; italics in original, my underlines)

Frances gets so infuriated when her homeland is described as “servility,” and she is depicted with the words “ire” and “defiance.” In her insistence on “blood-earned freedom,” we can see that her opinion on freedom, mentioned above in 2-1, is expressed. Hunsden

then tells Frances that “You would be a mad then, mad as March hare to indulge in a passion for millions of ship-loads of soil, timber, snow and ice” (200); he teases her severity by using words like “mad” and “passion.” Their quarrel continues in this manner, and after Frances stops and calls William for dinner, they resume it further. As she speaks these words as she thinks, we can say that her exposure this time is stronger than the time when she show it to William. Meanwhile, William demonstrates “a low laugh” to her attitude toward Hunsden and seems to have an air of superiority. He never interrupts their quarrel, and when they bring up a new subject after dinner, he bids farewell. At the same time, Hunsden decides to leave, and the quarrel ends. From William’s abrupt way of taking his leave, it becomes clear that he is confused about her attitude toward Hunsden, which she never shows him, and his wish to leave and end this situation as soon as possible is expressed by his actions. As he leaves, Hunsden tells Frances that “you have a spark of spirit; cherish it” (202); Hunsden acknowledges her “spirit” as one to be cherished.

It is interesting that Frances also shakes Hunsden before this scene, as Amano indicates (Amano 70). Before she gets infuriated, Frances unconsciously impresses Hunsden:

“Are you of the number of those to whom such associations give no pleasure?”

“Mademoiselle, what is associations? I never saw one; what is its length, breadth, weight, value—aye *value*—What price will it bring in the market?”

“Your portrait, to any one who loved you, would for the sake of association be without price.”

That inscrutable Hunsden heard this remark and felt it rather acutely too

somewhere, for he coloured, a thing not unusual with him, when hit unawares on a tender point . . . and I believe he filled up the transient pause succeeding his antagonist's home thrust, by a wish that someone did love him as he would like to be loved; some one whose love he could unreservedly return. (198; italics in original)

Hunsden first sneers at Frances' opinions about "associations" that have no "value," but he gets shocked soon after. He knows the value of something that has no price "in the market" in truth and longs to get it because he has the experience to love someone from his heart, as we see later. He shows his respect to Frances in his expression that he "deigned to bestow one slight glance of admiration" (199). From her words, Hunsden finds her spirit and in their quarrel, he must be convinced of it.

We can also see that Hunsden and Frances have some commonalities. When Hunsden presents an ivory miniature of the lady Hunsden loved but could not marry in the past, he and Frances seem to agree with each other. After taking the miniature, which has the word "Lucia" on it, back from William, Hunsden asks Frances, "What do *you* think of it?" (218; italics in original)

"I am sure Lucia once wore chains and broke them," was the strange answer. "I do not mean matrimonial chains," . . . "but social chains of some sort—the face is that of one who has made an effort, and a successful and triumphant effort, to wrest some vigorous and valued faculty from insupportable constraint—and when Lucia's faculty got free, I am certain it spread wide pinions and carried her higher than—" She hesitated—

“Than what?” demanded Hunsden.

“Than ‘les convenances’ permitted you to follow.”

“I think you grow spiteful—impertinent.”

“Lucia has trodden the stage,” continued Frances. “You never seriously thought of marrying her—you admired her originality, her fearlessness—her energy of body and mind, you delighted in her talent whatever that was . . . you worshipped her beauty—which was of the sort after your own heart—but I am sure she filled sphere from whence you would never have thought of taking a wife.”

(218)

Frances depicts the image of Lucia as an energetic lady who has the strength not to be bent by something that binds her. Hunsden does not agree nor disagree with such an image, but as he asks Frances the question, “don’t you feel your little lamp of a spirit wax very pale beside such a girandole as Lucia’s?” (218), we can assume that her presumption is not entirely mistaken. Frances then answers “Yes” (219) quickly and clearly; she is conscious of the difference between her passion and Lucia’s one. From this conversation, we can see that both Hunsden and Frances understand that Frances has the same passion as Lucia. Furthermore, Frances penetrates that he cannot choose Lucia as a wife even he “admired her originality, her fearlessness—her energy of body and mind.” Hunsden only answers “Ingenious,” but judging from his words that “I should certainly have liked to marry her and that I *have* not done so is a proof that I *could* not” (218; italics in original), her presumption might be correct again. On his way home after the first quarrel with Frances, Hunsden tells William:

“Your lace mender is too good for you, but not good enough for me: neither physically nor morally does she come up to my ideal of a woman. No; I dream something far beyond that pale-faced, excitable, little Helvetian. . . . Your Mdlle. Henri is in person *chétive*—in mind *sans caractère* compared with the queen of my visions.” (204; italics in original)

In this scene, the origin of “my ideal of a woman” and “the queen of my visions” is revealed as a lady like Lucia. Gilbert and Gubar argue that “his love for the enigmatic Lucia . . . offers Frances (and thus Brontë herself) a last chance to fantasize escape from the stifling enclosures of patriarchy” (333); Lucia is the last lady who appears in this scene to resist the patriarchy.

Afterward, Hunsden says, “the professor will soon be dissatisfied with the dim light you give.” Frances asks whether it is true, and William answers, “My sight was always too weak to endure a blaze, Frances” (219). It can be understood that William would not be able to stand with Lucia’s “blaze” passion and wants Frances to suppress her passion and keep it “dim.” They reach their destination, and their conversation ends there, so we cannot see how Frances and Hunsden react to William’s answer. However, considering that Frances longs to be under William’s control, she might not try to become Lucia. Consequently, Frances loses “a last chance” and retains her role as a submissive wife in the patriarchy.

As mentioned above, Frances has a passion for seeking freedom and a strong mind. However, she scarcely shows these to William and hopes to live obediently as his student. Recognizing and trusting her “spark of spirit,” Hunsden, as a catalyst, brings her smoldering passion for the hatred of slavery and freedom to the surface very easily. By

doing so, he brings out the passion that women who live in patriarchy never show and reveals their true selves under their masks.

Chapter 3 Hunsden and Victor

3-1 Reaction of William and Frances to Victor

One final point should be made about Hunsden's influence on Victor. To see this closely, it is necessary to first consider his relationship with his parents, William and Frances. William describes Victor's appearance that "Victor is as little of a pretty child as I am of a handsome man, or his mother of a fine woman; he is pale and spare, with large eyes, as dark as those of Frances, and as deeply set as mine" (219). Victor has elements of both William and Frances equally in his appearance. Regarding his character, William states the following:

. . . a something in Victor's temper, a kind of electrical ardour and power, which emits, now and then, ominous sparks . . . I call it the leaven of the offending Adam and consider that it should be if not *whipped* out of him, at least soundly disciplined, and he will be cheap of any amount of either bodily or mental suffering which ground him radically in the art id self-control: (222; italics in original).

William finds "a kind of electrical ardour and power" within Victor as "ominous" and that it is dangerous to leave it as it is. Frances also recognizes the danger of "a something in Victor's temper," but she seems to have a different idea about this:

Frances gives this *something* in her son's marked character no name, but when it appears . . . she folds him to her breast, or takes him to walk with her alone in the wood, then she reasons with him like any philosopher, and to reason Victor is ever

accessible, then she looks at him with eyes of love—and by love Victor can be infallibly subjugated— (222; italics in original).

Frances does not try to discipline Victor unlike William; instead, she adopts a gentle attitude to embrace, approve, and counsel him. Here, we see that Frances has affection for Victor because she finds that they have the same kind of passion.

3-2 Relations between Hunsden and Victor

Victor's relations with Hunsden seem to be bound by rigid ties. Victor is so attached to Hunsden that both William and Frances regard it as unfavorable; to which William says:

I see him [Victor] now—he stands by Hunsden— . . . Hunsden's hand rests on the boy's collar, and he is instilling God knows what principles into his ear. Victor looks well just now—for he listens with a sort of smiling interest, he never looks so like his mother, as when he smiles—pity the sunshine breaks out so rarely! Victor has a preference for Hunsden—full as strong as I deem desirable. . . . Frances too regards it with a sort of unexpressed anxiety— (222)

It should be noted that Victor's smile in the conversation with Hunsden is the same as his mother's, and it does not often appear except with Hunsden. Like Frances, Victor also shows his passion, which is scarcely exposed, only to Hunsden. William says, "I never saw a child smile less than he does" (219); it would be difficult for William to bring out Victor's smile even though he is Victor's father. As to Hunsden's opinion about "a

something in Victor's temper," Hunsden "calls it" Victor's "spirit and says it should not be curbed" (222); his attitude is affirmative and the opposite of William's. For this reason, it seems natural for Victor to be attracted to Hunsden. We can also say that Hunsden's attitude is the same as Frances', who affectionately embraces his spirit.

As part of the developing story about their relationship, Hunsden gives Victor a dog. Victor names the dog Yorke after the sender, and Victor enjoys the dog very much. One day, when Hunsden takes Yorke for a walk, Yorke is bitten by a dog suspected to be rabid. Hearing of the circumstances from Hunsden, William immediately shoots Yorke. Gilbert and Gubar indicate about this scene that "Now fully a patriarch and professor, he [William] sees Yorke Hunsden, as well as the dog Yorke, as a diseased, rabid element in his life" (Gilbert and Gubar 334); this incident symbolizes William's judgment of Hunsden as "a diseased, rabid element" that needed to be excluded. Victor sees the scene from a window, and he explodes against William with rage and sorrow:

I had scarcely been ten minutes in the house, when my ear was struck with sounds of anguish. . . . Victor was kneeling beside his dead mastiff, bent over it, embracing its bull-like neck and lost in a passion of the wildest woe: he saw me.

"Oh papa! I'll never forgive you! I'll never forgive you!" was his exclamation. "You shot Yorke—I saw it from the window—I never believed you could be so cruel—I can love you no more!"

.....

"He might have been cured—you should have tried—you should have burnt the wound with hot iron, or covered it with caustic. You gave no time; and now it is too late—he is dead!"

He sank fairly down on the senseless carcase; (220; my underlines)

Through these scenes, Victor exposes “a passion” and expresses his anger toward his father, who cruelly killed his dog. Oshimoto indicates that William tries to teach Victor calm judgment and self-control through this scene (Oshimoto 60), but it seems wrong because William judges that only Frances would comfort Victor and leaves his son with her (220); he does not reason Victor by himself. Victor listens to his mother’s persuasion after that and goes to his father’s room to make up with him. Nevertheless, William sees Victor “was melancholy for some weeks” (221). William also struggles with the relationship between Hunsden and Victor like in the case of Hunsden and Frances. Eventually, he decides to send Victor to Eton to reduce Hunsden’s influence from Victor completely.

However, at the end of the novel, the strong connection between Hunsden and Victor reappears. This intimates the instability of Crimsworth and the strength of Hunsden’s influence, and the final scene is as follows.

But Hunsden comes—I hear his step and there he is, bending through the lattice, from which he has thrust away the woodbine with an unsparing hand—disturbing two bees and a butterfly—

“Crimsworth! I say, Crimsworth! Take that pen out of his hand, Mistress, and make him lift up his head.

“Well, Hunsden? I hear you—”

“. . . Now Monsieur and Madame—if you don’t come to tea—Victor and I will begin without you.”

“Papa—come!” (223; my underlines)

Hunsden talks to William and Frances in a study, and the “Two bees and a butterfly” are Mr. and Mrs. Crimsworth and Victor. They are symbolized as the bees living in a cluster of British society at the time, and Victor has the potential to become a butterfly flying in the sky alone. Finally, Hunsden approaches and talks to them. This scene epitomizes the story. The person Victor calls “Papa” must be William, of course, but considering the close relationship of Hunsden and Victor, we can assume that Victor unconsciously refers to Hunsden as “Papa.” As a catalyst, Hunsden emphasizes Victor’s instability, unsettling the Crimsworths, which seems to be peaceful, happy, and ideal at first sight.

Chapter 4 Hunsden's Elements in Brontë's Later Novels

Being a catalyst who exposes the suppressed feelings of men and women under the patriarchy, Hunsden, as an element of her novels, is not portrayed by a specific character in Brontë's later novels. Instead, because her main characters and narrators become women, her suppressed emotions and outbursts are narrated by herself. Here, let us consider two of Brontë's later novels narrated in the first person as *The Professor: Jane Eyre* and *Villette*.

4-1 *Jane Eyre*

First, we will examine *Jane Eyre*, the novel Brontë wrote just after *The Professor*. In respect of *The Professor's* connection with *Jane Eyre*, Rodolff focuses on the resemblance between Hunsden and Rochester and regards Hunsden as an important character for the birth of *Jane Eyre*, one of Brontë's later masterpieces:

In particular, Hunsden's discovery of Frances' qualities in social conversation parallels Rochester's discovery of Jane—and more closely than it parallels Crimsworth's discovery of Frances in the classroom. This is partly because Crimsworth described *his* attraction to Frances—but also because he was attracted to a less complex Frances; one who never argued with him as she does with her new acquaintance, and one who spoke very little before the proposal scene. . . . Hunsden, unlike his friend, is protected from loving Frances by this tendency to wax satirical. . . . He is like Rochester, who is himself with Jane, claiming only the superiority of age and experience (Rodolff 80–81; italics in original)

It should be true that the conversation between Hunsden and Frances, not between William and Frances, is the pioneer of the relations between Rochester and Jane. At first, Rochester and Jane talk to each other as an employer and a governess, but this relationship is not maintained for as long as William and Frances. The relationship between Hunsden and Frances is passed onto Rochester and Jane in *Jane Eyre*.

However, Jane's character is very different from Frances; she barely shows her passion. When Rochester tells a lie that he will get married to Miss Ingram, Jane, taking it for the truth, fiercely shows her defiance by crying and saying she will leave Thornfield:

‘I tell you I must go!’ I retorted, roused to something like passion. ‘Do you think I can stay to become nothing to you? Do you think I am an automaton? —a machine without feelings? And can bear to have my morsel of bread snatched from my lips, and my drop of living water dashed from my cup? Do you think, because I am poor, obscure, plain, and little, I am soulless and heartless? You think wrong! —I have as much soul as you—and full as much heart! And if God had gifted me with some beauty and much wealth, I should have made it as hard for you to leave me, as it is now for me to leave you. I am not talking to you now through the medium of custom, conventionalities, nor even of mortal flesh; —it is my spirit that addresses your spirit; just as if both had passed through the grave, and we stood at God's feet, equal—as we are!’ (*Jane Eyre* ch. 23; my underlines)

She rises “to something like passion,” strongly opposes his attitude of regarding her as “an automaton” “without feelings” from her social position and appearances, and insists she and Rochester are equal because they have “soul” and “spirit.” From such an attitude,

we can see the powerfulness and intensity of when Frances speaks about freedom. Rochester compares Jane to “a wild frantic bird,” but she also is opposed to this, saying, “I am no bird; and no net ensnares me; I am a free human being with an independent will, which now exert to leave you” (ch. 23). She insists that she must be treated as a human. Furthermore, Jane feels furious about being regarded as “soulless and heartless,” and it is her deep sorrow from her separation from Rochester that is at the basis of her passion. Subsequently, she happens to know that Rochester’s wife Bertha is a “madwoman” and decides to leave Thornfield secretly. Jane describes her pain in leaving as follows:

I thought of him now . . . hoping I should soon come to say I would stay with him and be his. I longed to be his; I panted to return: it was not too late; I could yet spare him the bitter pang of bereavement. . . . I could go back and be his comforter—his pride; his redeemer from misery; perhaps from ruin. Oh, that fear of his self-abandonment—far worse than my abandonment—how it goaded me! . . . in the midst of my pain of heart and frantic effort of my principle, I abhorred myself. . . . As to my own will or conscience, impassioned grief had trampled one and stifled the other. I was weeping wildly as I walked along my solitary way: fast, fast I went, like one delirious. A weakness, beginning inwardly, extending to the limbs, seized me, and I fell: I lay some fear—or hope—that here I should die: but I was soon up; crawling forwards on my hands and knees, and then again raised to my feet—as eager and as determined as ever to reach the road.

(*Jane Eyre* ch. 27)

She is “trampled” by “impassioned grief” by leaving Thornfield and Rochester, her figure

torn between her desire to be with Rochester and her reason not to be with a married man is almost mad, as she compares herself to the “one delirious.” Like Frances, she hopes to be a free woman and live with the man whom she loves at the same time. At the end of this novel, she becomes an economically independent wife and supports Rochester, who has lost his eyesight, one arm, and mansion.

4-2 *Villette*

Next, in *Villette*, a parentless protagonist leaves England for the foreign country, Labassecour, and becomes a teacher at a pensionnat, and the development of the story is almost the same as *The Professor*. The protagonist, Lucy, decides to go to Villette, and the story includes her relations with Ginevra Fanshawe, a coquettish student in the pensionnat, who has a different attitude than Lucy’s calm character that seems to reflect Hunsden and William. Furthermore, the relations with M. Paul Emanuel, a teacher at the pensionnat and a cousin of Madame Beck, the directress, reflect William and Frances, as Paul teaches literature to Lucy, and reflects Hunsden and Frances as their discussion is on an equal footing, and he causes their passion to be exposed. Like Frances, Lucy is passive and calm, and she does not often expose her passion. At the end of the novel, however, Madame Beck, who is not pleased with the relations between M. Paul and Lucy, ships Paul to the West Indies, “Basseterre in Guadaloupe” (*Villette* 487). When she interrupts Lucy and Paul’s last meeting, Lucy exploits her passion and opposes this:

Pierced deeper than I could endure, made now to feel what defied suppression, I cried—

‘My heart will break!’

What I felt seemed literal heart-break; but the seal of another fountain yielded under the strain: one breath from M. Paul, the whisper, ‘Trust me!’ lifted a load, opened an outlet. With many a deep sob, with thrilling, with icy shiver, with strong trembling, and yet with relief—I wept.

‘Leave her to me; it is a crisis; I will give her a cordial, and it will pass,’ said the calm Madame Beck.

To be left her and her cordial, seemed to me something like being left to the poisoner and her bowl. When M. Paul answered deeply, harshly, and briefly—

‘Laissez-moi!’ in the grim sound I felt a music strange, strong, but life-giving.

.....

‘Femme!’ cried the professor not now in his deep tones, but in his highest and most excited key, ‘Femme! sortez à l’instant!’

He was roused, and I loved him in his wrath with a passion beyond what I had yet felt. (530–31; my underlines)

Madame Beck flatly rejects Lucy’s cry as “a crisis” and insists that it must be cooled down by “a cordial.” However, Paul does not deny Lucy’s passion. He opposes Madame Beck and drives her out of the room as if he had tried to save Lucy from any more suffering. Seeing his action, Lucy loves him “with passion.” In this scene, Lucy and Paul’s passion defeats Madame Beck, who tries to suppress it.

After they can be alone, Lucy suddenly feels anxious when Paul says he feels pain in seeing her pale face. She then presses him:

‘Ah! I am not pleasant to look at—?’

I could not help saying this; the words came unbidden: I never remember the time when I had not a haunting dread of what might be the degree of my outward deficiency; this dread pressed me at the moment with special force.

A great softness passed upon his countenance; his violet eyes grew suffused and glistening under their deep Spanish lashes: he started up; ‘Let us walk on.’

‘Do I displease your eyes *much?*’ I took courage to urge: the point had its vital import for me.

He stopped, and gave me a short, strong answer—an answer which silenced, subdued, yet profoundly satisfied. Ever after that, I knew what I was for *him*; and what might be for the rest of the world, I ceased painfully to care. Was it weak to lay so much stress on an opinion about appearance? I fear it might be—I fear it was; but in that case, I must avow no light share of weakness. I must own a great fear of displeasing—a strong wish moderately to please M. Paul. (533; italics in original)

Her fear that her appearance may be a displeasure for Paul presses her “at the moment with special force” so that she cannot help asking him for an answer, even though he tries to change the topic. Lucy has the mortal fear of being disliked by Paul and desires to be loved by him. Paul does not blame her and gives her “a short, strong answer,” and she feels relieved. Lucy distinctly confirms his feelings toward her, and they understand their feelings toward each other in this scene.

Paul then brings Lucy to an abode he buys for her and advises her to open her own school. Lucy accepts this and talks about the contradiction in which she separates from Paul: “they were the three happiest years of my life. Do you scout the paradox?” (543).

She admits that her pleasure in working at her school and making a living for herself surpasses her displeasure from being far away from the man she loves. It becomes clear that, like Frances and Jane, Lucy also wants to be independent of the patriarchy and be loved by the man she loves. We cannot say that this story comes to a happy ending because it is unclear whether Paul is alive or dead because of an accident on a wrecked ship. Nevertheless, Lucy triumphs over Madam Beck and confirms his love, and she gains prosperity as a directress. Therefore, Lucy becomes a successful woman with contradictory desires.

Conclusion

In this thesis, we first define Hunsden's character as hermaphrodite and ambivalent; he had both male and female aspects and is both an aristocrat and businessperson. Moreover, he has displeasure about the actual state of England like the author. However, he cannot exceed the social custom by himself. Therefore, he becomes a catalyst who shakes other characters' view to seek human's possibility. As to William, he shows himself as an intellectually superior and self-controlled person to readers. Even though, he cannot hide his longing for women. He tries not to be read his interior thoughts by others, but only Hunsden penetrates them boldly; this is the reason why William has displeasure about him. As a catalyst, Hunsden exposes William's suppressed desires which are thought as undesirable in the patriarchy. Hunsden also gives William help and advice to succeed in his life, but for William, being a patriarch at last, an ambivalent person like Hunsden is a hazardous element. Therefore, William communicates with Hunsden only in practical scenes as possible.

Frances is not an ideal woman at that time because she is thin and has literary ambition, compared to Middlemarch. She has both a strong passion for freedom and obedience for the man she loves. Being with William, she is usually obedient and tends to keep their professor-pupil relationship. Although she has the ambition to go to England and be a teacher there at first, she finally settles into William's wife like the angel in the house and does not show her passion. Nevertheless, Hunsden trusts her spirit and brings it out. As a catalyst, Hunsden exposes her suppressed passion under the mask she wears in front of William and understands its value. At the same time, she also penetrates Hunsden's thinking. William cannot intervene in their relations.

Victor has a passion which William regards as dangerous, but Frances embraces it warmly. Victor is attached to Hunsden because Hunsden does not refuse his passion, unlike his father. Through the scene in which William kills Victor's dog named Yorke soon after he hears that it is bitten by a rabid dog, we can assume that he regards Hunsden as a hazardous element. Nevertheless, the connection between Hunsden and Victor gets so strong that Victor seems to regard Hunsden as "Papa" unconsciously. William does not want Hunsden to influence Victor anymore, so that William decides to send Victor to Eton, far away from Hunsden.

Initially, William attempts to escape Edward's tyranny and seeks freedom. Frances also refuses common practices and has an intense desire to work even after marriage. However, at last, their destination is the ideal family of the time, and they fit into the frame of the patriarchy. This ending hardly seems to be the ideal future that Brontë, who never stopped writing although people told her that women should not have a pen and seek intellect, had pictured in her mind. Hunsden thus exists to raise doubts through the story, and a boy like Victor is born with the passion his parents used to have. However, there is nothing specific about Victor's instabilities. The story ends with only the evocation of a vague doubt about the patriarchy. Nevertheless, this story connects with Brontë's later work.

Jane Eyre and *Villette* share something in common; while both protagonists, Jane and Lucy, achieve independent positions and fortunes so that they can live alone, they still desire to be under the protection of the man whom they love. Their instability with contradictory elements, revolt and obedience, is the expanding form that the vague Frances suppresses and Victor exposes at the end of *The Professor*. *Shirley*, which we cannot see in detail in this thesis, also has such aspects. As Birch points

out, *Shirley* “defies oppression—not just the domestic oppression that men could exercise over women, but the political oppression Charlotte saw in relations between masters and workmen” (Birch 66). Defying oppression is the same factor as other novels. One of *Shirley's* protagonist, Caroline Herston, is suffered from her aspiration to work and longing for Robert Moore whom she loves, like other protagonists. Hunsden’s role has vanished in the protagonists’ exposure to their own rebellious spirits and passions. In other words, what Hunsden brings out in *The Professor* becomes the foundation for Brontë’s later works. In this respect, he should not be regarded as William’s double, and the novel should not be reviewed as clumsy and unnatural, owing to the use of a male narrator, unlike her later novels. Instead, its methods and attitudes, as attempts to expose doubts against the patriarchy, are well developed in later works and should be valued.

Bibliography

- Amano, Miyuki. "Ambition No Tsuikyū—*Kyouju [The Professor] Ni Okeru Tabi.*" *Brontë To 19seiki Igrisu*, pp. 63–73, in Japanese.
- Aoyama, Seiko. *Charlotte Brontë No Tabi—Hishou E No Kawaki*. Kenkyūsha, 1984, in Japanese.
- Avely, Simon. "Chapter 31. Politics." Thormählen, *The Brontës in Context*, pp. 261–68.
- Azim, Firdous. *The Colonial Rise of the Novel*. Routledge, 1993.
- Betsinger, Sue Ann. "The Professor: The Third Participant." *Brontë Studies*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 101–11, 2006.
- Birch, Dinah. "Chapter 7. Charlotte Brontë." Thormählen, *The Brontës in Context*, pp. 61–67.
- Black, Maggie. "Victorian Britain." *A Taste of History: 10,000 Years of Food in Britain*. Peter Burns et al. British Museum Press, 1993. pp. 263–302.
- Brontë, Ann, et al. *Agnes Grey; The Professor; Poems*. Illustrated by Arthur H. Buckland, Collin's Clear-Type Press, n.d. p. 218, 349.
- Brontë, Charlotte. *The Letters of Charlotte Brontë with a Selection of Letters by Family and Friends*. Ed. Margaret Smith, vol. 1. Oxford University Press, 1995.
- . *Villette*. Ed. Helen M. Cooper. Penguin, 2004.
- . *Jane Eyre*. in E-Book. Ed. Stevie Davies. Penguin, 2006. Kindle.
- . *The Professor*. Eds. Margaret Smith and Herbert Rosengarten. Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Brontë Society of Japan. *Brontë To 19seiki Igrisu*. Osaka Kyoiku Tosho, 2015.
- Gaskell, Elizabeth C. *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*. Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Gerin, Winifred. *Charlotte Brontë: The Evolution of Genius*. Clarendon Press, 1967.

- Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. Yale University Press, 1979.
- Kamiyama, Yasushi. “Chapter 6. Saisho No Honkaku Shousetsu *Kyouju* No Tokutyou.” *Charlotte Brontë Ron*. Ed. Hiroshi Nakaoka, Kaibunsha, 2001, pp. 123–45, in Japanese.
- Malone, Catherine. “‘We Have Learnt to Love Her More than Her Books’: The Critical Reception of Brontë’s *Professor*.” *Review of English Studies*, vol. XLVII, no. 186, 1996, pp. 175–87. *Oxford Academic*, <https://doi.org/10.1093/res/XLVII.186.175>.
- Maynard, John. *Charlotte Brontë and Sexuality*. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Minamoto, Tomomi. “Transformation of ‘Passion’ in *The Professor*.” *Studies in English Literature / Regional Branches Combined Issue*, vol. 11, 2018, pp. 219–26, in Japanese.
- Oshimoto, Toshimasa. “Boku Wa Eton Ni Muda Ni Ita Nodewa Nainda—*Kyouju* Ni Kometa Sakusha No Hiniku.” *Brontë To 19seiki Igrisu*, pp. 51–61, in Japanese.
- Rodolff, Rebecca. “From the Ending of *The Professor* to the Conception of *Jane Eyre*.” *Philological Quarterly*, vol. 61, no. 2, 1982, pp. 71–89.
- Shirai, Yoshiaki. [*Zouhoban*] *Charlotte Brontë No Sekai—Fukensei Kara No Dakkyaku*. Sairyūsha, 2007, in Japanese.
- Shuttleworth, Sally. *Charlotte Brontë and Victorian Psychology*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Thormählen, Marianne. *The Brontës in Context*. Cambridge University Press, 2012. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=498335&lang=ja&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

Thormählen, Marianne, and Steven Wood. “Chapter 33. Agriculture and industry.”

Thormählen, *The Brontës in Context*, pp. 276–82.

Uchida, Yoshitugu. *Brontë Shimai No Sekai*. Minerva Shobo, 2010, in Japanese.

Uda, Kazuko. *Brontë Shimai No Shokuseikatsu: Shougai, Sakuhin, Shakai Wo Moto Ni*.

Kaibunsha, 2020, in Japanese.