

SYNOPSIS

DICKENS'S CONCEPTION OF HUMAN BEINGS IN *DOMBEY AND SON*

Kôichi Hamada

Dickens's works are nearly incapable of discussion without a knowledge of the time when he was actually living. We often hear this kind of comment about his works, and this is certainly true. But the so-called 'relationship between society and human beings' is not so simple nor so easy to examine as it seems to be at first glance. There is an infinite variety of relationships between society and human beings.

The Victorian period was an age of material prosperity, and people who lived at that time were more or less under the influence of this material prosperity. They could not be immune to the general tendency of the age.

In this article I want to discuss this relationship between social circumstances and human beings, referring to Mr. Dombey, who was estranged from all human relations and who ruined his firm because of his materialistic way of thinking.

Dombey, the hero in *Dombey and Son*, is a typical example of a businessman who was deeply affected by the materialism of the age. A psychological approach to the hero, which was probably Dickens's first experiment of this kind in his career as a novelist, makes it much easier for the reader to observe the inner process of this egoistic and proud businessman.

What is most prominent in the psychology of Dombey is the deep torment caused by his estrangement from his daughter, his wife and all other human relations. The more he became estranged from them, the harder he clung to his belief that all people in the world were going against his will in spite of his greatness. Why did not they admit that he was the most powerful, and that all of them had to

obey his will? This simple but most serious question always galled his proud mind. Finally, he became aware of a grand force pushing him forward to some unknown destination. He did not notice that this force was the powerful influence of material civilization upon the individual, and that he was being pushed toward the gloomy end of this materialism. In a word, he was both champion and victim of the material civilization of the age.

In *Dombey and Son* there is no spiritual salvation as is often found in Dickens's early works. In *A Christmas Carol* Dickens bestowed salvation upon Scrooge by restoring to him the virtues of a good and kind businessman. As is often said, the three Ghosts in *A Christmas Carol* were *divine grace* to Scrooge. Dombey was not saved nor were virtues restored to him. His sufferings and hatred led him only to estrangement from people and the ruin of his firm.

This change signifies the change of Dickens's view of human beings. When he wrote *A Christmas Carol*, he believed in the possibility of the restoration of human nature by some means or other. But he seemed to have become skeptical about such a recovery of human nature at the time he wrote *Dombey and Son*. This does not necessarily mean that Dickens became sceptical about human virtue itself, but at least he could not but admit that the pressure of social circumstances upon the individual was becoming so strong that he had to reconcile himself to them after all. The reason there is no salvation in *Dombey and Son* is that Dickens was aware of this inevitable relationship between society and human beings.

In *A Christmas Carol* Scrooge is severely criticized for his egoism, but in *Dombey and Son* there is no disapproval nor any criticism of Dombey's materialistic way of thinking. Dickens only describes the psychological process of the hero, calmly observing him gradually becoming estranged from human relationships.

In this novel we can notice Dickens's deep disquiet about the prospects of material civilization and the destiny of human beings. He seems to say that material civilization will distort not only natural human relations but human nature as well.

FROM MORTAL TO IMMORTAL A NOTE ON HARDY'S CHARACTERS

Masago Akagi

The purpose of this article is to discuss Hardy's concept of man through some of his characters. They are divided roughly into two types: the mechanical, soulless and dependent; and the living, soulful and independent. The former, including Tess's mother, and the peasants in *The Return of the Native*, show no definite will to live their own lives. Neither do such persons show any efforts to live on earth in the fullest sense of the word. What they do is to live overawed by what they believe their "fate", which comes from the words of *the Compleat Fortune-Teller* or from their superstitions. In other words, they are completely overwhelmed by their fate; they are spiritually dead or soulless.

On the contrary, the living, soulful and independent characters, to which Tess, Eustacia, Henchard belong, stand stubbornly against the situation they are in. Such persons are neither satisfied with their present life nor accept anything against their own will. For they have each a pride of their own. They try to go beyond the limit of common life to achieve their ambitions, always suffering from painful conflicts and death-agony: in the process they have to face something that prevents their progress—this is destiny given to them.

But, after having overcome these conflicts they always find themselves resuscitated and awakened; through their bitter experiences they are spiritually enlightened. They come to recognize human weakness and ugliness within themselves that they have never noticed before. As a result, they assume a pure objective stand point toward themselves. Thus they come to notice a power both invisible and working in this world. Tess, for example, is brave enough to admit the power,

saying, "What must come will come." Unlike Tess's mother and the peasants, who are utterly possessed by something superstitious, Tess, Eustacia and others try to get through their own struggles and painful conflicts to make sure of the true meaning of their "fate".

Through these struggles they reach a sudden enlightenment: they are free to enter the immortal world where they can find within themselves a perpetual peace. What is most significant about such heroines is that their recognition of fate does not mean the compromise with it, nor their submission to it, but the possibilities of their spiritual enhancement from mortal into immortal.

GEORGE ORWELL AND SPANISH CIVIL
WAR, AS A TURNING-POINT IN
HIS WAY OF THINKING

Bin Miyai

The Spanish Civil war began in July, 1936, and ended in March, 1939, in which George Orwell joined in December, 1936 and got away from Spain in June, 1937. So his participation was only seven months, which is one-fifth of the whole course of the war. But this civil war gave a great influence to his way of thinking as one of the gentlemen radical in 1930's. We have to notice that he participated in this war not as a war-correspondent but as a militia-man; that his group was not the International Brigade at Madrid, but POUM (Partido Obrero de Unificacion Marxista) at Barcelona, Catalonia; and that he did his duty with a deep guilty-conscience toward the Spanish people of the underdeveloped district. His motive was at first a simple, naive sense of justice to protect what he called "common decency." Unfortunately his battlefield was Barcelona, the real stage of the most complicated double inner battle, having their common enemy, the Franco's Fascist Army on their front. The *Coup d'etat* was held against the Government of the People's Front by the Spanish Communist Group. Orwell's simple sense of justice as a radical citizen was completely destroyed by this realistic side of the complicated and dubious battle. He was wounded and disillusioned, and left Spain. He was furious over two facts: the Communists insisted on the apologetic infallibility of their official party-line; they tried to report not what had happened in the war, but what ought to have happened. He wrote afterward his two representative novels, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, by this anger to the totalitarian feature in the official party-line, and by the horror to the dehumanizing political movement in the war.

SENTENCE STRUCTURE IN CHAUCER'S PROSE

Akio Oizumi

Chaucer as a prosaist has unreasonably been neglected, and his art and style have hitherto aroused cursory attention for several reasons. The chief among them, as Professor Schlauch remarks, are in the misconception that English medieval prose writers had not tried to fashion their language towards aesthetic ends, and in the fact that Chaucer's prose is for the most part translation or close paraphrase of foreign originals.

On the presumption that Chaucer was a great master in the adaptation of subject matter to style, the present paper is an attempt to handle, as a criterion of syntax and style, the four peculiarities of sentence structure in his prose works, manifesting a fine correlation with the demand of literary form and intention.

Those grammatical peculiarities are treated under the following headings :

1. pleonastic use of the conjunction *that* ; 2. excessive use of the relative adjective *which* ; 3. pleonastic pronoun constructions ;
4. correlative constructions.

This kind of examination centering around his rendering of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, i. e., *Boece* leads us to the following conclusions :

1. Pleonastic conjunction *that*, relative adjective *which* with a repeated antecedent, pleonastic pronoun constructions and some of correlative constructions—they are more frequent in his prose works than in the other works (in verse), contributing to characterize his prose style.
2. They make the Boethius translation, more than in the other prose works, display considerable variety of sentence structure.

3. They seem to have been sanctioned in Middle English usage and stylistically justified for reasons of clarity and emphasis.
4. They prove a great step (from the second to the last—L. Kellner) towards completing grammatical subordination, while they also show traces of earlier parataxis (einen Rest der Vorstufe der eigentlichen Unterordnung—H. Eitle).
5. A syntactical comparison between verse and prose brings out the fact that the former is more paratactic, the latter having more hypotactic, sometimes artificial, sentence structure characterized by grammatical constructions discussed here.

OBJECT CONSTRUCTION AND *WITH*-TRANSFORMATION

Teruhiro Ishiguro

The transformational theory of grammar which was proposed by Noam Chomsky and has been investigated in many ways, makes use of two types of transformational rules—the *simple transformation* in which a sentence is converted into another by means of simple transformational rules, and the *generalized transformation* which is actually combining two sentences to form a third sentence by means of much more complicated rules called generalized transformational rules.

This paper deals with a discussion about generation of *indirect-object constructions* and *have sentences* in English, making use of the idea of the above introduced types of transformation. Generation of *indirect-object constructions* and *have sentences* is discussed and examined by means of a hypothetical rule called *With Transformational Rule*.

First, a similarity between English *causative* and *indirect-object constructions* is studied. Their similarity results from their sharing the sentence-complement of the same type in their underlying structures. The relationships between the indirect-object and the direct-object, and the object and the objective-complement are observed from the transformational point of view.

Secondly, the relationship between *indirect-object constructions* and *have sentences* is discussed. The structure of the *have sentence* is analyzed, and by paraphrasing some *have sentences* into some *copula sentences* the synonymous quality of the two construction is discovered.

The hypothesis that a *have sentence* is the result of the transformation applied on a *copula sentence* is introduced, but after a minute investigation from various angles, the hypothesis is rejected.

An alternative theory that a *have sentence* has a *copula sentence*

(*be + with + NP*) as its underlying structure is introduced and examined. And appropriateness of this analysis is revealed by many examples.

With transformational rule is not almighty, but it proves to be very powerful in explaining generation of many *indirect-object constructions* and *have sentences*.

The disposal of Prepositional Phrases in the present analysis being a grave matter, the main concern is directed toward the process of the deletion of Prepositional Phrases in the following part.

Finally, a possibility that *With transformation* could be applied to any *copula sentence* is proposed.

Generation of an indirect object is a long discussed problem in generative grammar. However, no convincing conclusion has been obtained. This analysis, in which it is argued that an indirect object is derived from an underlying *copula sentence* as the result of the application of a set of compact transformational rules, seems to be promising. The reason for this assertion is that we can deposit a wide range of syntactic meaning to those *copula sentences* which underlie the *indirect-object construction* and the *have sentence*. Though this is not a complete presentation of the idea, it is expected that the whole conception will prove to be unique and adequate.