

Title	Sensation, dogs and ambiguity : the paradox of inter-species relationship in Aurora Floyd
Sub Title	センセーション、犬、両義性：『オーロラ・フロイド』における異種間関係をめぐる逆説的位相
Author	越智, 友里絵(Ochi, Yurie)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学藝文学会
Publication year	2025
Jtitle	藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.128, (2025. 6) ,p.138 (23)- 151 (10)
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-01280001-0138

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.

Sensation, Dogs and Ambiguity:

The Paradox of Inter-Species Relationship in *Aurora Floyd*ⁱ

Yurie Ochi

As Anna Feuerstein observes, animals occupy a notable position in Victorian realist novels, and the representation of dogs, in particular, warrants closer attention. Bulls-Eye in Charles Dickens's *Oliver Twist* mirrors the personality of his owners. The rabid dog in Charlotte Brontë's *Shirley* symbolizes crisis and violence, while Gyp in George Eliot's *Adam Bede* exemplifies loyal companionship.

Not only realist novelists, but also sensation novelists incorporate dogs into their novels, using these animals to convey emotion, social tension, or psychological depth.ⁱⁱ In Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White*, Mrs. Catherick's dead dog represents the owner's future danger. In addition, in Mrs. Henry Wood's *Johnny Ludlow*, the dog is portrayed as replaceable. The dog's owner is shocked when the dog dies, but soon recovers, as he is given another of the same breed. After having searched for his lost companion, he meets another, who is similar to the last dog, Don. He decides to get a new dog and names him "Don the Second" (125).

Mary Elizabeth Braddon's *Aurora Floyd*ⁱⁱⁱ presents an inter-species relationship specifically between the heroine and her dog. The heroine, Aurora, is depicted as an animal enthusiast, for she cherishes a companion dog Bow-wow and horses. In addition, the novel is enriched by other animal figures. For instance, Aurora's blackmailer, James Harrison, is a dog fancier and a dog howls in order for people to notice the murder. Critical attention has been attached only to a part of the inter-species relationship, however. Marline Tromp, while discussing the whipping of Aurora with Steeve Hargraves, argues that image of Aurora and her dog overlaps. Kate Watson mentions, "Dogs can also be instrumental in the motivations

that lie behind crimes” (17), as the dog abuser Steeve Hargraves commits the murder of James Conyers. However, these articles discuss the dogs in an attributive manner, but neither study really delves into the inter-species relationship.

This essay focuses on animal representations in *Aurora Floyd*, especially on the inter-species relationship between Aurora and Bow-wow, untangling Braddon’s problem of ambiguous representations. It seems, on the surface, that the narrative endorses the inter-species relationship between the heroine and her canine companion, but the novel also paradoxically possesses the negative side of domestication—which is its anthropocentric issue. The novel is also ambiguous for its paradoxical attitude towards the dogs: while it emphasises the intimate relationship with dogs, the novel also reflects the fear of dogs. Furthermore, the inter-species relationship contributes to gender ambiguity. While the novel seems to present dogs as masculine, by explaining Aurora’s enthusiasm for the dog contributes to Aurora’s unfemininity, the writing is double-voiced, for Bow-wow is drawn as a figure that is devoid of the typical representation of the mastiff. Rather, considering the depiction of the dog, this inter-species relationship in fact can be considered as traditionally feminine. This essay wants to suggest that these ambiguous, contradictory representations of inter-species relationship (and characters) in sensation fiction serve to reflect ambivalence, which is typical of modern ideology.

On one level, *Aurora Floyd* explores the inter-species relationship through the heroine and her dog. Aurora is given a mastiff dog called Bow-wow by her father when she is little. Their intimacy is depicted by their physical proximity; the dog is often seen by the heroine’s side. Aurora rides in a carriage with Bow-wow: “the mastiff Bow-wow travelled in the carriage with his mistress” (52) and she spends her spare time “pulling Bow-wow’s ears” (53). When the heroine is filled with despair, the dog sits “by her side, with his heavy head lying on her lap, and his big dim eyes lifted to her face” (326). Bow-wow is represented as a loyal worshipper who senses the heroine’s mood:

How marvellous is the sympathy which exists between some people and the brute creation! I think that horses and dogs understood every word that Aurora said to them,—that they worshipped her from the dim depths of their inarticulate souls, and would have willingly gone to death to do her service. (49)

Bow-wow supports the heroine emotionally by expressing her emotion for her behalf. When the dog encounters Steeve Hargraves, who threatens Aurora in their home Felden Woods, he barks at him:

[A]t last a face that [Aurora] hated made itself visible at the angle of the window, opposite to that against which she sat. It was the white face of the ‘Softy’, which was poked cautiously forward a few inches within the window-frame. The mastiff sprang up with a growl, and made as if he would have flown at that ugly leering face, which looked like one of the hideous decorations of a Gothic building
(327)

By sensing the heroine’s agitation, the dog allies with Aurora and faces forthcoming danger. The companion supports the heroine emotionally and physically.

As John Berger states of the relationship between a man and his pet, “[t]he pet *completes* him, offering responses to aspects of his character which would otherwise remain unconfirmed” (15), likewise the inter-species relationship between Aurora and Bow-wow is complementary. This relationship—dog helping the master emotionally—is called “emotional prosthesis” (Chez 17).^{iv} Chez refers to the dog’s role as an “emotional prostheses,” which bring “a new relationship between self and Other” (17). Chez elucidates the notion of prosthesis as “togethering” (56), the conjoining of the prosthesis and the user, and states that the dog supports his owner emotionally.

The fact that a canine companion is the heroine’s prosthesis which supports her is foreshadowed in her attraction to dogs. The heroine’s enthusiasm for the dog starts in her childhood, and she knows “the subject of pointers, setters, fox-hounds, harriers and beagles” (21). In addition, her loss of identity is connected with an indifference towards dogs. After the devastating marriage to James Conyers, Aurora returns to Felden Woods: “[Aurora] was out of spirits too, had no appetite, slept badly, was nervous and hysterical, no longer took any interest in her dogs and horses, and was altogether an altered creature” (25). This suggests a part of her identity is her connection with her animals.

It is further revealed that the heroine’s dog works as an emotional prosthesis when

Bow-wow is hurt. When Aurora's prosthetic dog gets hurt and has no choice but to leave her side, she behaves impulsively and cannot control her emotions. When a prosthesis is damaged and cut away from the user, the user's balance is destabilized and distortion occurs. When Bow-wow, Aurora's emotional prosthesis, is damaged and cannot work as a prosthesis temporarily, Aurora loses emotional support. Without having an emotional prosthesis, Aurora acts impulsively and is described as an animal. The process by which Bow-wow is injured is depicted through a violent accident. A month before Aurora's marriage to John Mellish, the dog is run over by a carriage and his legs and eyes are damaged: "[Bow-wow] had been run over by a pony-carriage in one of the roads about Felden, and had been conveyed, bleeding and disabled, to the veterinary surgeon's. . . ." (137). The dog is further injured by the servant. These injuries cause Bow-wow to not be able to work as Aurora's prosthesis. While Aurora takes a walk and talks to the stable-man, Hargraves carries a set of harnesses and kicks Bow-wow with ironed clogs. When Aurora hears Bow-wow's painful cry, she grabs Hargraves with a quick movement:

Aurora sprang upon him like a beautiful tigress, and catching the collar of his fustian jacket in her slight hands, rooted him to the spot upon which he stood. The grasp of those slender hands, convulsed by passion, was not to be easily shaken off; and Steeve Hargraves, taken completely off his guard, stared aghast at his assailant. Taller than the stable-man by a foot and a half, she towered above him, her cheeks white with rage, her eyes flashing fury, her hat fallen off, and her black hair tumbling about her shoulders, sublime in her passion. (138) ^v

Aurora looks down at Hargraves in indignation and starts whipping him. Since she loses the emotional prosthesis that offers her comfort, she cannot remain emotionally stable and acts impulsively. As Deborah Gorham explains, in the 19th century, emotional restraint was regarded as important among men and women, and expressing intense emotion is unfavorable (145-6); the emotion should be concealed. Aurora, whose facial features already show intense fury, takes a "slender whip" which "stings like a rod of flexible steel" and later breaks "in half-a dozen pieces" (138). Not only does she violate the moral code, but she also crosses the boundary of gender norms. While it is a patriarch's duty to whip the servants, Aurora,

as John Mellish's wife, performs the husband's duty. These actions indicate that without the emotional prosthesis, the heroine loses composure and judgement, and becomes unable to control herself.

While the affectionate inter-species friendship is revealed through the prosthetic dog, the novel also paradoxically contains an anthropocentric issue. Its emphasis on intimacy between the owner and the dog leads to backgrounding anthropocentrism by normalizing the subjugation of animals. For instance, Bow-wow is expected only for the utility—to buttress the heroine's emotion. The canine companion which stands as the master's "emotional prosthesis" contains the negative side of domestication.

This negative side of domestication can be understood in relation to Victorian society's humane treatment of animals. According to Harriet Ritvo, the position of animals changed greatly in England around this time. Before the 19th century, animals possessed criminal responsibility, and there were some cases which requested the death penalty for animals. However, from the late 18th century and early 19th century, with the rise of humanitarianism, animals no longer possessed criminal responsibility and rather the owners of the animals were held accountable (Ritvo 9-11). The Victorian period saw a changing of place for animals. James Turner clarifies the Victorians' interests towards animals in relation to the spirituality of humans. There was a paradigm shift that humans are the descendants of animals and the sympathy towards animals and the interests in animals' pain grew (xi-xii). This contributed to Victorians' interests in animals and led to the establishment of The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) in 1824. Of all animals, dogs were the most favoured. When the pet boom started around 1854, dogs became the center of people's attention, leading to the world's first dog show hosted in Newcastle in 1859. As humans welcomed dogs as family members, humanitarianism "kindly" made animals into a controllable object.

Hence, the "prosthesis" possesses two connotations—the intimacy and the subjugation of animals. This troubling aspect of the inter-species relationship corresponds to what Kreilkamp calls "anthro-prosthesis" (39). Kreilkamp insists that animals are used as tools to define the non-animality of human beings in the Victorian period (37-38).^{vi} By using the animals as tools, humans can distance themselves from the animals. The novel's inter-species relationship also concerns the function of "anthro-prosthesis" (29). Bow-wow being Aurora's

prosthesis helps explain why the heroine is described as a tigress when she whips Steve Hargraves. This is due to Kreilkamp's assertion that, through the interaction between human and animals, "human beings define and buttress their own identity in relation to 'prosthetic dogs' and other creatures" (38). These indicate, in essence, a canine companion functions as defining the non-animality of human beings. When considered from the opposite perspective, the boundary between humanity and animality becomes blurred when the user loses the prosthesis. As already mentioned, when Aurora's Bow-wow is damaged, she punishes the animal abuser by whipping him. Having considered the fact that the animal prosthesis is vital for segregating the human from the animal, the prosthesis's impairment suggests that the heroine cannot establish humanity. Hence, Aurora is described as "a beautiful tigress" (138).^{viii} The tiger "epitomized what men had to fear from the animal kingdom and from restive human subordinates" (Ritvo 40). The tiger was feared because the species was fond of the flesh of humans: tigers inhabit crowded areas such as India or Ceylon hunt domesticated animals, which eventually resulted in attacking humans (Ritvo 40). This links with the heroine's position in society and her actions. In a society where gender disparities are prevalent, her action threatens the structured order of patriarchy, and Aurora is a subordinate to her husband John Mellish. Hence, when the prosthetic dog is damaged and cannot work as a prosthesis, the heroine's behavior is pictured like that of a tigress. The narrative possesses a contradiction. While the text praises inter-species relationships, as there exists "sympathy" (49), the text is actually distancing from the animals. The word "sympathy" (49) serves to romanticize the subjugations of animals.

While the novel focuses on the intimate relationship between the owner and the dog, it also indirectly suggests the fear of rabies in the 1860s. Victorian people regarded dogs as part of the family and cherished them, but dogs associated with certain classes were also the object of fear in the Victorian period. The rabies epidemic started around 1830 in England. Philip Howell explains the history of the disease and its effect on Victorians. Although the number of deaths was lower than other contemporary diseases such as cholera, the disease was feared since the "origins were very imperfectly understood" (162). When the epidemic started, it was considered that dog-fighting was the cause, hence, "the lowest and the criminal classes" (163) were blamed for it. While public entities implored to control animals in the public areas (163-64), the government did not take any action. Since the rabies was associ-

ated with lower classes, it also became a biopolitical issue.

The novel reflects the Victorian people's fear of rabies by portraying the lower classes and dogs as being associated with the heroine's danger. John Conyer's death, which eventually makes Aurora a suspect of murder, is found by "the howling of a dog" (287) that "how[s] awful, and wouldn't leave [Conyer]" (295). The dog-fancier Matthew Harrison demands money in an exchange for keeping Aurora's secret.^{viii} The heroine's danger and the character who brings her danger are associated with dogs.

The novels ambiguity further lies with the problem of gender ideology. On the surface, the novel portrays loving dogs as an unfeminine trait, making the association with dogs an essential element for the untraditional heroine. However, looking closely at the representation of Bow-wow makes us question whether the association with dogs connotes unfemininity, as Braddon confuses readers by betraying the typical Victorian association of gender-based relationships with dogs.

On the surface, Braddon produces the "unwomanly" (47) heroine while presenting the inter-species relationship. Indeed, the dogs and the heroine's pet contribute to the unfemininity of Aurora. Her unfeminine childhood is explained as her having "rejected a doll and asked for a rocking-horse" (21) when she is six, and shows a keen interest in the breeds of dogs such as "pointers, setters, fox-hounds, harriers, and beagles" (21) at the age of ten. At the age of eleven, she figures out "the horses in the Linfield stables as a pack of screws," she wins "a Derby sweepstakes" by picking "the winning horse" at twelve, and she joins riding "across county with her cousin Andrew, who was a member of the Corydon hunt" at thirteen (21). The narrator points out that "[b]efore Miss Floyd emerged from the nursery she evinced a very decided tendency to become what is called 'fast,'" (21) meaning Aurora has a natural subversiveness. The interest in the animals therefore contributes to her "fast" nature.

The novel further elucidates the association of dogs with subversiveness by juxtaposing the unconventional dark heroine with the conventional fair heroine. While the dark-haired Aurora's allure is described "like the strength of that alcoholic preparation; barbarous, intoxicating, dangerous, and maddening" and "Cleopatra in crinoline" (33), another female character in the novel, Lucy, who is fragile, timid, gentle and devoted is represented as the embodiment of Angel of the House. What is interesting about the characterization of Lucy is that she is afraid of dogs and horses. She is "frightened of horses and dogs" (93),

and “direfully afraid of [Aurora’s] ponies and Newfoundland dogs” (21). Moreover, unlike Aurora, Lucy “could be happy without the society of Newfoundlands and Skye terriers” (218). Clearly, through Lucy, the novel reflects society’s idea of dogs as unwomanly objects. In fact, Chez indicates that “middle-class masculinity became redefined as the power to affectively connect with animals such as dogs, thereby developing the ability to govern via affective intimacy rather than violence” (3). Hence, Aurora’s development of an intimate relationship with her companion is suggested as a departure from traditional femininity.

The novel also foreshadows that the dog’s presence is only needed for the “improper” heroine. After her past is revealed, Aurora leaves Mellish Park and heads to see Lucy and her husband, Talbot Bulstrode, in chapter XXVIII. Bow-wow witnesses Aurora leaving her house and he does not appear in the text thereafter. In the latter part of the novel, the proud heroine changes into a woman who worries if she is forgiven by her husband. She refrains from acting in an unwomanly manner; the plot is driven by male characters. All the detectives and other characters associated with James Conyers’s murder are male, and Aurora becomes a victim who is rumored to be a murderer. She grows passive and makes no attempt to prove her innocence. As Natalie Schroeder mentions, Aurora is “punished for her masculine behavior” and after her bigamy is out, she “becomes subdued, tamed, and feminine . . . ultimately learns she must accept the convention of society” (99). In the end, Aurora accepts the gender ideology of Victorian society. The ending emphasizes her inner change:

So we leave Aurora, a little changed, a shade less defiantly bright, perhaps, but unspeakably beautiful and tender, bending over the cradle of her first-born.... I doubt if my heroine will care so much for horseflesh, or take quite so keen an interest in weight-for-age races as compared to handicaps, as she has done in the days that are gone. (459)

The narrator states Aurora’s change in her attitude and interests. She becomes less repulsive; it seems her interests in horses decrease and “her unfeminine tastes” (49) have lessened. Earlier in the novel, Bow-wow stands by her side, but now the dog is replaced by a baby, and the heroine becomes a mother, suggesting that her unfeminine nature is repressed, and she turns into a modest woman. ^{ix}

While the juxtaposition of two heroines and the ending seems to assign the dog to the “unfeminine” or “improper” heroine, a closer examination of Bow-wow suggests Braddon’s reluctance to reinforce a strict dichotomy between masculinity and femininity; Bow-wow’s characteristics raise the question of whether or not Bow-wow stands as a symbol of Aurora’s unfemininity.

In fact, the mastiff dog Bow-wow is represented as an ambiguous figure, and the characterization challenges the contemporary views on the breed. First, Bow-wow is depicted as lacking the characteristics which are typical of a mastiff. Before his injury by a pony carriage, in the early part of the novel, Bow-wow is introduced as “twelve years old” (41) and “purbblind” (49). The character’s aging and his impairment are stressed. In fact, his physical impairment contradicts the expectations of a mastiff as a guard dog. In contemporary Victorian views, the Mastiff is “noble animal, docile and intelligent” (Bilby 23) and “bold and trusty watch-dog” (*The Children’s Picture-Book of Quadrupeds and Other Mammalia* 73). William Youatt’s *The Dog*, a specialized book on dogs, explains that the mastiff “watches the abode of his master with the completest vigilance” (99). The mastiff’s virtue is retold, especially from the breed’s strong sense of caution. For instance, Thomas Bingley introduces three heroic tales about the mastiff: In every story, mastiffs sense the danger coming to the house and protect the house from the threat (167-80). In all three stories, mastiffs are vigorous and their quick movements enable their heroic acts. All these contemporary books reinforce the role of the mastiff as a guard dog. While the specialized book and children’s books regard mastiffs as having vigilance, Bow-wow’s characterization betrays such expectations. Bow-wow’s aging suggests his lack of strength and his impaired eyes signify his inability to watch over the house.

Another contradiction lies in the character’s behavior and treatment. Although mastiffs were kept as guard dogs during the Victorian era, the novel’s mastiff diverges from such the expectations. As already mentioned, he is allowed to travel with Aurora in a carriage. In addition, although mastiffs are usually kept outside, Bow-wow is permitted to stay inside. To put it plainly, Bow-wow is treated like a lapdog. From an early age, he is raised like a lapdog, for he is permitted to “sprawl upon the table during the little girl’s lessons, upset ink-bottles over her copy-books, and [eat] whole chapters of Pinnock’s abridged histories” (41). Although mastiffs are traditionally linked with masculinity, by emasculating and depicting Bow-wow

as lacking the critical essence of the mastiff, Braddon again blurs the categorization.

Furthermore, Braddon confuses the typical gender-based relationship with dogs. Sarah Amato points out there is a difference in gender in the relationship between the owner and the dog. While dogs' relationships with male masters were "mastership and alliance," women were "pictured being guarded by [the dogs] or struggling to dominate" (Amato 79). Given the novel's association of dogs with unfemininity, the inter-species relationship can be seen as Braddon challenging traditional gender-based assumptions. As Bow-wow is called "the submissive animal" (332) and Aurora "quiet[s] him with a look" (85), their relationship is similar to that of dogs and men, reinforcing its coding as unfeminine.

However, given the fact that Bow-wow's characterization corresponds to a lapdog rather than a guard dog, it becomes questionable whether or not dogs can clearly stand as symbols of unfemininity in the novel. The women's relationships with lapdogs are an exception: "The only images in which women dominate their dogs figure lapdogs" (Amato 83), meaning the association of women with submissive lapdogs is a typical feminine representation. The fact that Bow-wow is more like a lapdog does not contradict the gender association of the relationship with dogs, raising doubts about whether the association with dogs necessarily connotes unfemininity. The contradictions lie in the characterization which is untypical of the mastiff and the typical relationship between women and dogs.

Aurora Floyd's multilayered ambiguities—particularly in its characters representations—are not the results of the writer's inconsistency and hesitation but rather can be regarded as reflecting the modern ideology. J. A. Green, while using sociologist Zygmunt Bauman's approach, views the Victorian period as a part of modernity and an inconsistent, contradictory age and regards sensation fiction as the genre that reflects "the cultural discontinuity sense of modernity" (6), which signifies the uncertainty of modernity. Green also argues that sensation fiction gave the readers epistemological training through the "cultivation of uncertainty, doubt, and ambivalence" (13).^x The ambiguities that lie in inter-species relationships are the manifestation of cultural ambivalence in modernity. The contradictory characterization reflects cultural ambivalence, and the contradiction resists the readerly resolution, giving the readers training for enduring the uncertainty.

NOTE

- i This paper is an expanded and revised version of a presentation given at the 96th conference of English Literary Society for Japan. I deeply appreciate all the insightful comments.
- ii Lately, sensation novels are discussed in relation to the representation of animals. As regards Mary Elizabeth Braddon, Sarah Rick focuses on the construction of Robert Audley's masculinity with regards to his stray dogs in *Lady Audley's Secret*. For Wilkie Collins' works, Monica Flegel reads the villain Count Fosco from *the Woman in White* as a closeted homosexual, and insists that he parodies the patriarch with his animals. Furthermore, the connection between sensation novels and animals is not limited to the presence of dog characters. Victorian critics negatively regard sensation fiction as animalistic. Henry Mansel denounces the genre as having a "commercial atmosphere," (33) describing its "ravenous appetite for carrion" and "vulture-like instinct" (47). Similar sentiments can be seen in "Our Female Sensation Novelists," insisting that the genre "[stimulates] the attention through the lower and more animal instincts" (107).
- iii Braddon's *Aurora Floyd* is her second-best seller. It was originally serialized in *Temple Bar Magazine* from 1862 to 1863. Critical attention has been largely paid to the heroine of the novel, Aurora Floyd. *The "Improper Feminine"* discusses that the heroine is "transgressing the boundaries of the proper feminine" (88) and the novel is about correcting the "improper" heroine. Another point which raises critical attention is about marriage. Maia Mcaleavey focuses on proposal and bigamy and Laurie Garrison insists the gender roles are reversed in the marriage of Aurora and John Mellish. Kaari Newman explores the readers of *Temple Bar Magazine* in the 1860s and insists that Braddon portrays a marriage of an independent woman.
- iv Chez developed Ivan Kreilkamp's assertion of dogs as prostheses. Kreilkamp raises another example of prosthesis, a dog that Fanny leans on in Thomas Hardy's *Far from the Madding Crowd*, mentioning that the relationship between Fanny and dog is "a less dominating, collaborative conjoining of animal and human under the sign of friendship" (40).
- v This scene has received significant critical attention among scholars. While Natalie Schroeder argues in "Feminine Sensationalism, Eroticism, and Self-Assertion" that the whipping is an act that increases Aurora's sexual appeal, Marlene Tromp analyses that the novel consistently associates Aurora and Bow-wow and that Hargraves' attack on Bow-wow can be his assault on Aurora (114).
- vi For instance, Kreilkamp explains the representation of animals in Hardy's works. He pays attention to the scene when Jude is ordered to use crackers to prevent animals from trespassing in *Jude the Obscure*. By making a noise, Jude protects the territory and segregates the humans from the animals. Kreilkamp calls the cracker an "anthroprosthesis" (40) tool that

- distinguishes humans from animals.
- vii The fact that the heroine is regarded as a tigress is related to degeneration, the response to Darwinian fear raised by Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859). When the heroine commits/seems to commit immoral behavior, the narrator connects her with animality. Apart from this passage, when the heroine is suspected of committing a murder, the narrator describes her as "this beautiful tigress" (377).
 - viii As for animal sellers in the street, Jane Hamlett and Julie-Marie Strange explain "[s]treet selling had all kinds of negative connotations for Victorian consumers" (56). Interestingly, in the novel, James Harrison also expresses the faithfulness of dogs: "there's no knowin' the faithfulness of them animals" (85). His relationship with a dog is also intimate, as he refuses to sell his favourite dog: "but this here bull-tarrier's father and mother and wife and fambly to me, and there aint money enough in your pa's bank to buy him, miss" (85).
 - ix Furthermore, the writer's ambiguity is seen in the novel's attitude. Although the novel presents a new form of heroine, it remains a question whether the novel endorses subversiveness. Jessica Cox explains the ambiguity of sensation fiction being categorized as feminist novels and elucidates why Elain Showalter avoided labelling sensation novelists as feminists (62). As for *Aurora Floyd*, Tatum concludes that *Aurora Floyd* and *Lady Audley's Secret* ultimately reinforce the symbolic order and cannot be regarded as subversive.
 - x Bauman argues that modernity has a desire for order and "ambivalence is a side-product of the labour of classification" (3) and modernity efforts tries to eradicate ambivalence. Culture, which is a "hate-love relation" with modernity, is needed since "The modern powers' struggle for artificial order needs culture that explores the limits and the limitations of the power of artifice" (9).

Works Cited

-
- Amato, Sarah. *Beastly Possessions: Animals in Victorian Consumer Culture*. U of Toronto P, 2015.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Polity Press, 1991.
- Berger, John. *About Looking*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2009.
- Bilby, Thomas. *The Book of Animals: For the Amusement and Instruction of Young Persons*. Leavitt and Allen, 1858.
- Bingley, Thomas. *Stories about Dogs: Illustrative of Their Instinct, Sagacity, and Fidelity*. David Bogue, 1854.
- Braddon, Mary Elizabeth. *Aurora Floyd*. Edited by P.D. Edwards, Oxford UP, 2008.
- Chez, Keridiana W. *Victorian Dogs, Victorian Men: Affect and Animals in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture*. Ohio State UP, 2017.
- Collins, Wilkie. *The Woman in White*. Edited by John Sutherland, Oxford UP, 2008.

- Cox, Jessica. *Victorian Sensation Fiction*. Red Globe Press, 2019.
- Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species*. Edited by Gillian Beer, Oxford UP, 1996.
- Dickens, Charles. *Oliver Twist*. Edited by Kathleen Mary Tillotson, Oxford UP, 2008.
- Eliot, George. *Adam Bede*. Edited by Carol A. Martin, Oxford UP, 2008.
- Feuerstein, Anna. "Victorian: Character, Politics, and Racialization." *The Cambridge Companion to Literature and Animals*. Edited by Derek Ryan, Cambridge UP, 2023, pp. 94-111.
- Flegel, Monica. "A 'Strange Family Story': Count Fosco, His Animal Children, and the 'Safe' Patriarch in *The Woman in White*." *Queer Victorian Families: Curious Relations in Literature*, edited by Duc Dau and Shale Preston, Routledge, 2015, pp. 99-115.
- Garrison, Laurie. *Science, Sexuality and Sensation Novels: Pleasures of the Senses*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Gorham, Deborah. *The Victorian Girl and the Feminine Ideal*. London: Croom Helm, 1982.
- Green, James A. *Sensation Fiction and Modernity*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2024.
- Hardy, Thomas. *Far from the Madding Crowd*. Edited by Suzanne B. Falck-Yi, Oxford UP, 2008.
- . *Jude the Obscure*. Edited by Caroline Hobhouse and Edward Leeson, Macmillan, 1974.
- Howell, Philip. *At Home and Astray: The Domestic Dog in Victorian Britain*. U of Virginia P, 2015.
- Kreilkamp, Ivan. "Anthroprosthesis, or Prosthetic Dogs." *Victorian Review*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2009, pp. 36-41.
- Mansel, Henry. "Sensation Novels." *Varieties of Women's Sensation Fiction: 1855-1890: Volume 1 Sensationalism and the Sensation Debate*, edited by Andrew Maunder, Routledge, 2004, pp. 32-56.
- McAlevey, Maia. *The Bigamy Plot: Sensation and Convention in the Victorian Novel*. Cambridge UP, 2017.
- Newman, Kaari. "Temple Bar's New Portrait of Femininity: Active Domesticity in Mary Braddon's Aurora Floyd." *The Wilkie Collins Journal*, vol. 16, 2019, <https://wilkiecollinsociety.org/temple-bars-new-portrait-of-femininity-active-domesticity-in-mary-braddons-aurora-floyd>.
- "Our Female Sensation Novelists." *Varieties of Women's Sensation Fiction: 1855-1890: Volume 1 Sensationalism and the Sensation Debate*, edited by Andrew Maunder, Routledge, 2004.
- Pykett, Lyn. *The Nineteenth-Century Sensation Novel*. Northcote House Publishers, 2011.
- . *The "Improper" Feminine: The Women's Sensation Novel and the New Woman Writing*. Routledge, 1992.
- Rick, Sarah. "Gathering 'Stray and Benighted Curs': Pet-Keeping and Masculinity in Lady Audley's Secret." *Nineteenth-Century Gender Studies*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2022, <https://ncgsjournal.com/issue181/rick.html/>.
- Ritvo, Harriet. *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age*. Harvard UP, 1987.
- Schroeder, Natalie. "Feminine Sensationalism, Eroticism, and Self-Assertion: M. E. Braddon and

- Ouida." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1988, pp. 87-103.
- Tatum, Karen, E. "Bearing Her Secret: Mary Elizabeth Braddon's *Aurora Floyd*." *The Journal of Popular Culture*, vol. 40, no. 3, 2007, pp. 503-25.
- The Children's Picture-Book of Quadrupeds and Other Mammalia*. Sampson Low, Son & Co., 1860.
- Tromp, Marlene. *The Private Rod: Marital Violence, Sensation, and the Law in Victorian Britain*. UP of Virginia, 2000.
- Turner, James. *Reckoning with the Beast: Animals, Pain, and Humanity in the Victorian Mind*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1980.
- Watson, Kate. "The Hounds of Fortune: Dog Detection in the Nineteenth Century." *Clues: A Journal of Detection*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2011, pp. 16-25.
- Wood, Mrs. Henry. *Johnny Ludlow: Six Series*. Macmillan and Co., 1901.
- Youatt, William. *The Dog*. Charles Knight, 1848.