

Title	Knowlege and self-betrayal in George Eliot's 'The Lifted Veil'
Sub Title	
Author	高松, みどり (Takamatsu, Midori)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学藝文学会
Publication year	1997
Jtitle	藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.73, (1997. 12) ,p.224- 239
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	安藤伸介, 岩崎春雄両教授退任記念論文集
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-00730001-0224

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

Knowledge and Self-betrayal in George Eliot's 'The Lifted Veil'

Midori Takamatsu

George Eliot's last book, *Impressions of Theophrastus Such*, published in 1879, is an inquiry into the cultural climate of the day in the form of sketches and essays. In this book she disguises herself as a male narrator 'I', and in the early part of the book, this narrator poses a question: 'Is it . . . possible to describe oneself at once faithfully and fully?' The subject under discussion is about that kind of book which deals with the writer's own life and doings, and the narrator asserts that in all autobiographies 'incompleteness' is inevitable. He observes that there are matters on which 'we are each of us bound to reticence': we keep silence, he argues, sometimes out of regard for the feelings or rights of others, and sometimes out of respect for our own dignity. But there are cases, he points out, in which the incompleteness arises unintentionally. Citing Rousseau's *Confessions* as an example, the narrator remarks on a curious effect of the unconscious dissimulation thus:

But the incompleteness which comes of self-ignorance may be compensated by self-betrayal. A man who is affected to tears in dwelling on the generosity of his own sentiments makes me aware of several things not included under those terms. Who has sinned more against those three duteous reticences than Jean Jacques? Yet half our impressions of his character come not from what he means to convey, but from

what he unconsciously enables us to discern.⁽¹⁾

If a person tries to reveal himself to the world, he must necessarily be prevented from telling the whole truth; but sometimes concealment itself, especially when it is done unconsciously, reveals something important — this is the gist of George Eliot's argument here about autobiographies. How is the case, then, with a fiction in the form of an autobiography? The narrator in such books also conceals or reveals something unconsciously? This is a question worth asking when we read 'The Lifted Veil'; this weird story about clairvoyance and attempted murder involving a revivification experiment is the only one in George Eliot's fictional works that is narrated in the first person, and I believe that consideration of the element of 'incompleteness' in this story will give us some clue to her narrative strategy in general.

'The Lifted Veil' was written and published anonymously in *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1859, and this year proved to be a turning point in George Eliot's career as a novelist. *Scenes of Clerical Life*, a collection of three novellas published in the previous year, was the first work that appeared under the pseudonym of George Eliot, and this book first brought her literary fame. Then in February in 1859, her first full-length novel *Adam Bede* was published and at once won a great success. Once the name 'George Eliot' gained popularity, however, an authorial recognition game came to harrass Marian Evans, and eventually she was driven on the edge of an identity crisis — the author-ship was wrongly attributed to a man called Joseph Liggins, and Liggins himself did not deny it. To solve this Liggins myth problem it would be necessary to reveal her own identity, sooner or later, yet the revelation was in fact a most embarrassingly difficult matter for her. After her elopement with him in 1854 she had continued to cohabit with George Henry Lewes; but unfortunately Lewew's wife Agnes was then

still alive, and under this circumstance to call herself Marian Evans Lewes was of course illegal. And yet to name herself just Marian Evans meant banishment from respectable society.⁽²⁾ She was indeed caught in a dilemma.

In this period around the year 1859 Eliot had another cause of anxiety about the future; the prospects for reconciliation with her family grew dimmer and dimmer. Her brother Isaac Evans, later depicted as Tom Tulliver in *The Mill on the Floss* (1860), was a stolid man but very obstinate as well; he decidedly resisted any attempt at reconciliation, and it was not until she married John Walter Cross in 1880 that he acknowledged her as a member of the family — this year was also the year of her death. Eliot's last recourse at that time was her sister Chrissey Clarke; she had expected to effect a reconciliation with his brother through the intervention of this elder sister. Yet Chrissey died in the very year 1859 and, as Knoepfelmacher suggests, the death of this reliable sister crushed her hope of reunion with the past.⁽³⁾

Eliot's sojourn in Germany with Lewes in the previous year also enhanced her sense of isolation. The climate of Munich did not agree with her — its oppressive atmosphere was to be reflected later in 'The Lifted Veil' — and Lewes was then engrossed in his research for a book entitled *The Physionomy of Common Life* (published in 1859-60). Yet it was through Lewes that Eliot became familiar with advanced sciences — physiology, anatomy, geology and physics. Moreover, she acquired an acquaintance with the eminent scientists of the day, such as the anatomist Karl von Siebold and the chemist Justus von Liebig. The year 1859 was indeed a memorable year for science; it was in this year that Darwin's *Origin of Species* was published.⁽⁴⁾ Eliot took a keen interest in the trend of those contemporary advanced sciences; under their influence she began to contemplate the validity of her own

characterization in her novels from the viewpoint of the theory of evolution or scientific determinism.

As a Victorian agnostic, Eliot shared the sense of anxiety prevalent in the 1850s among intellectuals including Lewes, Darwin, Herbert Spencer and Harriet Martineau (Eliot aroused rivalry in the last two, it seems); driven by this feeling they sought for an unknown order which would fill the void created by disbelief. Latimer, the morbid narrator of 'The Lifted Veil', is possessed by 'previsions', and his uncanny capacity for seeing into the future could be seen as a metaphor for the fanatic aspirations of this age — aspirations to discover the unknown and restore the lost equilibrium. In 'The Lifted Veil' this spiritual trend of the age seems to affect people in two distinct ways. On the one hand, such fanaticism impels a person with a practical mind to pursue expansion of wealth and power. A good example of this type is Latimer's father, who is described as 'a firm, unbending, intensely orderly man, in root and stem a banker, but with a flourishing graft of the active landholder'.⁽⁵⁾ Such impetus was in itself a powerful motivation for Britain's imperialism. A person of 'sensitive, unpractical order', on the other hand, is very differently affected by the fanatic trend of the age; Latimer, an example of this type, only turns his back on worldly interests in order to satisfy 'the poet's sensibility' (33).

In *Scenes of Clerical Life* and *Adam Bede* Eliot made full use of her past experiences; various scenes and incidents she had witnessed in her youth no doubt helped her much in creating a realistic atmosphere in these works. Indeed, her skilful exploitation of the resources of the past was one important factor of the success of the first two books. It seems that, while engaged in them, Eliot did not much trouble herself about the matter of 'art' — in this period she wrote spontaneously, as it were. After the success of *Adam Bede*, however, she evidently began

to consider the matter seriously; in *The Mill on the Floss* we can discern a definite sign of her consciousness regarding the narrative art. There are highly autobiographical elements in this novel and, indeed, one could say that the heroine Maggie Tulliver is almost Eliot's alter ego⁽⁶⁾; yet despite that — or rather, for that very reason — the omniscient narrator stays completely outside of the story looking on Maggie with intentional detachment. But the germ of her narrative tactics is in fact found in the earlier short story, 'The Lifted Veil'. In composing her first two works Eliot relied on the past resources; but in 'The Lifted Veil' she tried on a bold experiment in narration, using the first person 'I' as a narrator who has a capacity for looking into the future. In this story not the past but the future he foresees restrains the narrator's conduct. After her sister's death Eliot was obliged to shake off her sentimental feelings towards the past; it now became vitally necessary for her to face the past with an objective eye. It may be possible to argue, therefore, that, in order to achieve narrative detachment to the past, Eliot reversed the ordinary relation between characters and time.

In her letter written on 31 March 1859 Eliot first mentions 'The Lifted Veil' to the publisher John Blackwood: 'I have a slight story of an outré kind — not a jeu d'esprit, but a jeu de melancolie'.⁽⁷⁾ As she says, the story itself is quite melancholy; it is told by Latimer the clairvoyant whose hope of self-realization as a poet has been frustrated. The first half of the story is set in the Continent (where Eliot herself experienced a feeling of isolation away from familiar ground). Latimer is to be educated in science; this plan results in part from the questionable diagnosis made on Latimer by a 'phrenologist' Mr Letherall (this ominous name derives from 'Lethe', the river of oblivion), and in part from his father's recent involvement in a mine

speculation.⁽⁸⁾ But his father rests his hope on his eldest son Alfred as his successor ; after being educated at Eaton and Oxford, Alfred is now expected to marry the 'fatal-eyed' Bertha Grant, 'a Water-Nixie' (37).

Latimer feels that he was happier in his childhood than now because 'the curtain of the future was impenetrable' then (30)—predictability proves baneful. The person who most contributed to rendering his childhood happy was his mother ; his father and brother were his rivals for his mother's love, and his temporary blindness caused by an eye trouble helped Latimer occupy her attention. After his mother's death, however, he was no longer able to escape the dominion of his father, who imposed on him a course of education least congenial to his nature.⁽⁹⁾ Latimer's tutor was a positivistic man, who assured him that 'an improved man, as distinguished from an ignorant one, was a man who knew the reason why water ran downhill'.⁽¹⁰⁾ Yet Latimer 'did not want to know why it ran' ; he had 'perfect confidence that there were good reasons for what was so very beautiful' (32-33).

Averse to knowledge, Latimer turns to nature. He adores Rousseau, and with this virtual mentor of his he shares romantic sensibility and reflectiveness. But part of his tragedy lies in the fact that he lacks creativity :

You will think, perhaps, that I must have been a poet, from this early sensibility to Nature. But my lot was not so happy as that. A poet pours forth his song and *believes* in the listening ear and answering soul, to which his song will be floated sooner or later. But . . . the poet's sensibility that finds no vent but in silent tears on the sunny bank, when the noonday light sparkles on the water, or in an inward shudder at the sound of harsh human tones, the sight of a cold human eye — this dumb passion brings with it a fatal solitude of

soul in the society of one's fellow-men. (33)

He feels least solitary when, following Rousseau's example, he is in his boat floating around the centre of the lake. Communication with common, practical kinds of men, such as his father and brother, makes him feel all the more isolated ; it is on the water secluded from that nuisance that he really experiences security.

In Geneva Latimer meets two persons who are to have a deep influence on his life : Charles Meunier and Bertha Grant. Each of them presents a contrast to Latimer ; Meunier shows a remarkable talent for medical studies for which Latimer has no aptitude, and Bertha is a shallow-minded woman who lives only to gratify her vanity, never having any appreciation of sensibility such as Latimer's (in a sense Bertha is an archetype of Rosamond Vincy in *Middlemarch*). Latimer tells us that in his boyhood Meunier was as much isolated as himself, and that 'communion of feeling' made them friends. In his later school days at Geneva Latimer suffered from a severe illness, and this illness and the reappearance of his father upset the equilibrium he had managed to keep.

During his languid convalescence Latimer finds that he possesses strange abilities : prevision and mind-reading. His first prevision is the oppressive scene of the city Prague, and then he successively sees two visions, which are apparently related to his future marital life. He assures himself that these visions must be a sort of déjà-vu when the vision of the 'Water-Nixie' is materialized by the appearance of Bertha. Just after seeing the first vision of the girl, he becomes suspicious of his sanity :

But *was* it a power? Might it not rather be a disease — a sort of intermittent delirium, concentrating my energy of brain into moments of unhealthy activity, and leaving my saner

hours all the more barren? I felt a dizzy sense of unreality in what my eye rested on . . . (37)

But when he sees the second vision of Bertha as a malevolent cruel-eyed wife of his, who thinks within her : 'Madman, idiot! why don't you kill yourself, then?' (44) — then he feels certain that it is he and not his brother Alfred who will marry Bertha. Even after Alfred is engaged to Bertha, therefore, Latimer desperately attempts to ingratiate himself with her, for fear that she should think his mental condition abnormal. This fear of being considered insane, together with his rivalry with his brother, urges his morbid telepathic insight into others' minds, which is intrinsically libidinal.

Looking back on his deathbed Latimer realizes anew that his whole life — a life of disappointment and barrenness — has been rendered all the more miserable by his 'wretched knowledge'. Indeed, for the very power of mind-reading he suffers a poignant pain countless times. Yet with respect to this 'knowledge' Bertha is an exception ; on her and on her alone his insight does not work. Concerning her thoughts he is always 'in a state of uncertainty', and asks for her opinions 'with the real interest of ignorance' (40). Moreover, because she is his only 'oasis of mystery in the dreary desert of knowledge' (43), he refuses to pay any regard to the sinister third vision in which poisoning is implied, and, in the end, his brother's sudden death enables him to marry her. But his happiness does not last long ; he comes to know that Bertha, his once-wished-for wife, is gradually poisoning him. Meeting Latimer after a long interval, Meunier, now a celebrity in the field of medicine, instinctively senses a difference between the present Latimer and the Latimer in the old days. Meunier performs an experiment of revivification by transfusing blood into the dead body of Mrs Archer, the maid, and the resurrected Mrs Archer reveals Bertha's attempted

murder of Latimer — the 'veil' is lifted here. But for Meunier's experiment, Latimer would die more peacefully without 'knowing' his wife's inmost wickedness. In this sense the progress of science is equivalent to Latimer's weird power of 'knowing'.

Latimer shuts his eyes to the third vision, whereas he misunderstands the first one — the vision of Prague. His father's chance mention of the name Prague awakes a strange sensation in him ; then suddenly the gloomy scene of the city emerges before him :

My father was called away before he had finished his sentence, and he left my mind resting on the word *Prague*, with a strange sense that a new and wonderous scene was breaking upon me: a city under the broad sunshine, that seemed to me as if it were the summer sunshine of a long-past century arrested in its course — unrefreshed for ages by the dew of night, or the rushing rain-cloud ; scorching the dusty, weary, time-eaten grandeur of a people doomed to live on in the stale repetition of memories, like deposed and superannuated kings in their regal gold-inwoven tatters. The city looked so thirsty that the broad river seemed to me a sheet of metal ; and the blackened statues, as I passed under their blank gaze, along the unending bridge, with their ancient garments and their saintly crowns, seemed to me the real inhabitants and owners of this place, while the busy, trivial men and women, hurrying to and fro, were a swarm of ephemeral visitants infesting it for a day. It is such grim, stony beings as these, I thought, who are the fathers of ancient faded children, in those tanned time-fretted dwellings that crowd the steep before me ; who pay their court in the worn and crumbling pomp of the palace which

stretches its monotonous length on the height ; who worship wearily in the stifling air of the churches, urged by no fear or hope, but compelled by their doom to be ever old and undying, to live on in the rigidity of habit, as they live on in perpetual midday, without the repose of night or the new birth of morning. (34-35)

Latimer is at first puzzled over this vision; but he soon comes to consider the strange phenomenon to be an unmistakable sign of his poetic creativity. It is worth noting here that this description of Prague bears a marked resemblance to that of Rome in *Middlemarch*. Staying in Rome with Casaubon, Dorothea receives no favourable impressions from the present ruinous state of the city :

Ruins and basilicas, palaces and colossi, set in the midst of a sordid present, where all that was living and warm-blooded seemed sunk in the deep degeneracy of a superstition divorced from reverence ; the chiller but yet eager Titanic life gazing and struggling on walls and ceilings ; the long vistas of white forms whose marble eyes seemed to hold the monotonous light of an alien world : all this vast wreck of ambitious ideals, sensuous and spiritual, mixed confusedly with the signs of breathing forgetfulness and degradation, at first jarred her as with an electric shock, and then urged themselves on her with that ache belonging to a glut of confused ideas which check the flow of emotion.⁽¹¹⁾

This description is given by the author herself as an omniscient narrator, and the author obviously associates the lifeless ruins of Rome with the sterility of Casaubon's life ; in other words, the narrator is fully aware of the implication contained in this description. In the case of Prague, however, it is narrated by the first person narrator Latimer,

who is apparently not aware of the obvious implication contained in his own description. He takes the vision for a sign of his creativity, and thus misses the opportunity to realize the infertility of his gifts implied in the vision, while we readers realize what he cannot. As the narrator in *Impressions of Theophrastus Such* observes, 'incompliteness which comes of self-ignorance may be compensated by self-betrayal'.

Latimer's illusion about his poetic gift does not survive long, but his uncanny power which first manifests itself in this Prague vision continues to cling to him as a lifelong tormentor. Faced by impending death he deplores predictability, emphasizing the 'need of something hidden and uncertain for the maintenance of that doubt and hope and effort which are the breath of its [our soul's] life' (52). Deprived of this 'breath' of life, Latimer evidently regards his strange power as a 'curse' of his life. But B. M. Gray maintains that Latimer's misery is self-inflicted one. In his response to the Prague vision Gray finds 'the moral flaw on which subsequent events depend', because 'instead of recoiling in pain from the doomed inhabitants trapped in their barren hell of purposeless repetition . . . he longs, unhealthily, for a reprise'. Gray considers that Latimer is not doomed by prevision but has his choice of accepting it or rejecting it as 'the agent of his own destiny'.⁽¹²⁾ Indeed, Rome 'jarred' Dorothea, but Prague enlivens Latimer; and by this 'unhealthy' response Latimer invites subsequent visions and thus 'chooses' his lot — a lot of treachery and sterility.

Apart from his uncanny power, then, Latimer has some innate inclinations or propensities which are in themselves potentially pernicious to himself. In his boyhood, unable to assimilate the insipid education his tutor provided for him, Latimer was in secret absorbed in books to his own liking — Rousseau, Shakespear, and Cervantes. They are of course all standard authors, but Latimer's addiction to *Don*

Quixote is worth some notice. In *Madness and Civilization* Michel Foucault observes that Don Quixote's frenetic images are governed by the arrogance and the imaginative self-complacency.⁽¹³⁾ Putting aside the question whether Latimer is mad or not, arrogance and self-complacency are certainly the two basal constituents of his professed poetic sensibility. From his boyhood he has been dominated by those around him — his father, brother, and tutor ; his position is always weak, and the only resistance he can offer is to despise them by calling them 'prosaic' (he repeatedly uses the word). At the same time, by laying excessive stress on his own poetic sensibility he deludes himself into believing that he is their superior ; his morbid sensibility is in a sense a disguised expression of his latent — or oppressed — desire for 'power'. Yet quite unexpectedly this power falls into his hands. His brother's sudden death brings him not only Bertha but also the inheritance. Now that he possesses the patriarchal authority, however, he gradually loses his former passions and aspirations and, after all, sinks into helpless apathy (Bertha's hatred for him arises in part from this).⁽¹⁴⁾ Although Latimer attributes his unhappiness to his uncanny power, there certainly are some inner factors for his lifelong misery ; yet apparently he has no consciousness of it. Perhaps this could be regarded as another instance of self-betrayal by self-ignorance.

Let us finally consider how far we can rely on Latimer as a narrator. Towards the end of the story the scene of his own 'dying struggle' opens upon him (65). Indeed, as a narrator Latimer tells his story at his dying hour, so it is just possible that he speaks in delirium. Moreover, if he is not delirious, Latimer in his later life is a miserable broken man. Looking upon the later Latimer as a victim of extreme determinism, 'the opposite of the hysteric, who has ceased even to desire desire', Terry Eagleton maintains that 'apart from Meunier,

there is no knowledge in this fiction which is not either useless or malevolent'.⁽¹⁵⁾ The latter half of Latimer's life is certainly characterized by apathy about the present and bitterness towards the past ; at the same time, there is a sort of cool objectivity in his way of reciting which gives eerie reality and strange reliability to his narrative. Furthermore, by 'knowledge' if Eagleton means 'useful knowledge' (as opposed to 'useless' one), there certainly is such knowledge in Latimer's story. Confronted by impending death Latimer bitterly preaches a lesson concerning 'words' and 'meaning' :

So much misery — so slow and hideous a growth of hatred and sin, may be compressed into a sentence! And men judge of each other's lives through this summary medium. . . . We learn *words* by rote, but not their meaning ; *that* must be paid for with our life-blood, and printed in the subtle fibres of our nerves. (57)

Using 'we' and 'our' he generalizes his statement, but of course he is talking about himself here; he is implicitly confessing that he has discovered the true 'meaning' of some 'word'. Then what is this 'word'? — 'Prague', of course. The word 'Prague' was a 'mere name' when he saw the vision ; but now, just before his death, he has realized that the 'meaning' implied in that vision of Prague was the prosaism and commonplaceness he so loathed.⁽¹⁶⁾ That first vision was indeed a turning-point in his life ; by taking the vision for a sign of his poetic gift he plunged into the miserable course of life. But at last on his deathbed he 'knows' that that vision in fact implied his lack of creativity. This is certainly too ironical to be untrue. And perhaps his attempt at this narration is an attempt at giving some 'meaning' to his miserable life. Anyway, we need not trouble ourselves about the reliability of Latimer's narrative any more.

The main characters in George Eliot's works are seldom deserted by the author. They have each of them their own weakness and faults, and they have to tread a thorny path of life; some of them are misdirected, and others are disappointed in their views. But they are in the end saved from ruin, for Eliot had a deep sympathy for ordinary people's serious and diligent efforts to live. She believed that those people had made history, and this understanding of history always underlies her works. In this respect, however, 'The Lifted Veil' is the only exception; this story is curiously void of the sense of history. An atmosphere of uneasiness and unsteadiness pervades the world of the story, and perhaps Eliot's mental state when the story was written is reflected there; in this period she could place reliance neither on the past nor on the future. While writing Latimer's struggle Eliot probably meditated on her future course as an author, yet she tried an experiment in narrative in this story, which was obviously intended as a preparation to the following works, entirely governed by the omniscient narrator.

NOTES

- (1) George Eliot, *Impressions of Theophrastus Such*, ed. Nancy Henry (1879; London: William Pickering, 1994), p. 5.
- (2) Because of Agnes Lewes's infidelity, Lewes had the right to petition Parliament for a divorce; however, his lack of necessary funds made it difficult. See Frederick R. Karl, *George Eliot: Voice of a Century*, (New York: Norton, 1995), p.137.
- (3) U. C. Knoepfelmacher, *George Eliot's Early Novels: The Limits of Realism*, (Berkley: Univ. of California Press, 1968), p. 137.
- (4) It was unfortunate coincidence for Lewes that *The Physiology of Common Life* was published in the same year as Darwin's *Origin of Species*. Karl states that it might have had much greater impact if it had not been published simultaneously. Yet he adds the importance of Lewes's book especially lies in 'areas where he could apply animal

experimentation to human behaviour'. See Karl, p. 287. Moreover, Kate Flint informatively points out that Lewes argues about 'uses of our blood' in a chapter of his book citing a study of Charles-Edouard Brown-Séquard, a doctor distinguished for his revivification experiments. Stating that both Lewes and George Eliot were familiar with Brown-Séquard's work, Flint attributes the prototype of Charles Meunier to him. See Kate Flint, 'Blood, Bodies, and *The Lifted Veil*,' *Nineteenth Century Literature*, vol.51, no.4 (March 1997), pp. 464-67.

- (5) George Eliot, 'The Lifted Veil,' *A George Eliot Miscellany*, ed. F. B. Pinion (Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes, 1982), p. 31. All subsequent references to this edition are given parenthetically.
- (6) George Eliot, *The Mill on the Floss*, (1860; Oxford: Clarendon, 1980), pp. 7-8. In the first chapter of this novel, the narrator recollects the days the story is set in.
- (7) George Eliot, *The George Eliot Letters*, ed. Gordon S. Haight, 9 vols. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1954), III, p. 41.
- (8) Phrenology is a typical example of pseudoscience of this age, however, along with mesmerism it had a great influence even on intellectuals such as Harriet Martineau.
- (9) We notice 'The Lifted Veil' forms the counterpart of *The Mill on the Floss* in some ways: unmanliness of Latimer and unwomanliness of Maggie Tulliver; inadequate scientific education for Latimer and inappropriate classic education for Tom Tulliver; Latimer's aversion to knowledge and Maggie's blind aspiration for knowledge.
- (10) Positivism, completed by Auguste Comte (1798-1857), had a deep influence on Victorian agnostics. Maintaining that man makes progress passing through three stages Comte established 'Law of the Three Stages' where man passes from theological recognition through the metaphysical to the positive, that is, final stage, in which observation and experimentation are made much of in order to understand natural phenomena.
- (11) George Eliot, *Middlemarch*, (1871-72; Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), p. 188.
- (12) B. M. Gray, 'Pseudoscience and George Eliot's "The Lifted Veil",' *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, vol. 36, no. 4. (March 1982), p. 419.
- (13) Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, trans. Richard Howard

(1961 ; New York : Vintage, 1988), p. 31.

- (14) As for this point, Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar indicate obvious similarities between George Eliot and Latimer as the victim of patriarchy in terms of feministic viewpoint. See Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *The Madwoman in the Attic*, (New Haven : Yale UP, 1979), pp. 445-57.
- (15) Terry Eagleton, 'Power and Knowledge in "The Lifted Veil",' *George Eliot*, ed. K. M. Newton (London : Longman, 1991), p. 59.
- (16) Charles Swann asserts that Latimer is unable to understand the meaning of the Prague vision to the last ; see his 'Déjà Vu : Déjà Lu : "The Lifted Veil" as an Experiment in Art,' *George Eliot : Critical Assessments*, 4 vols. ed. Stuart Hutchinson (Mountsfield, East Sussex : Helm Information, 1996), III, p. 78.