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The central world of *Dombey and Son* (1846-48) is formed by the extremely patriarchal order with Dombey as the ruling figure. In this world, as it is clearly shown by the name of the House “Dombey and Son,” only the verticality between father and son is regarded as valuable. Mother and daughter are repressed or excluded as a heterogeneity which brings chaos into Dombey’s entirely homogeneous text. In fact, his wife Fanny dies barely noticed just after little Paul’s birth, and his daughter Florence, who also acts as mother to Paul, is only a “piece of base coin that couldn’t be invested” for him (according to Mrs. Chick, “‘Florence will never, never, never, be a Dombey’” (p. 50)). Maternity in surrogate mothers is also repressed. Paul’s wet-nurse Polly Toodle, the mother-figure, is permitted to enter the central world only when she becomes the masculinized “Richards” (p. 18). Miss Tox, would-be mother, is only elevated to the godmothership of Paul “in virtue of her insignificance” (p. 49).

But do mother and daughter really take on such a negative role for the maintenance of that patriarchal society as Dombey thinks they do? Do they have those potentialities which at the end of the novel cause such a reversal of the power relationship between paternity and maternity as Julian Moynahan concludes, “A Victorian patriarchy of stiff and tyrannical men of affairs surrenders to a matriarchy of weeping mothers and daughters”? In this essay I will explore in *Dombey and Son* the mother-daughter relationship which must be suppressed in favor of the Victorian idealization of the father and the
husband as patriarchs, and then the roles imposed on mother and daughter by the society of the day will be made clear.

Among the women concerned with Dombey, a mother-daughter dyad such as Mrs. Skewton and Edith, though in the subplot, vividly represents how much the daughter's bond with her mother prevents her independence. Edith, who must live through patriarchal society with the arms of beauty and pedigree, tries to find a man who buys her at the highest price in the marriage market. For that purpose, she has to bear erotic charms as a “badge or livery” (p. 376) and reduce herself to an exhibition. She becomes degraded into an article of commerce as she herself says, “I have not had an accomplishment or grace that might have been a resource to me, but it has been paraded and vended to enhance my value, as if the common crier had called it through the streets” (p. 724). Dombey considers his second wife Edith a “bargain” (p. 381) and simply utilizes her both as an exhibition which redounds the credit of the House with his customers and as an instrument which makes “Dombey and Son” substantial again after Paul’s death and sustains the male genealogy. It is her own mother Mrs. Skewton who has transformed her into such an exhibition with high commercial value. She has also changed herself into an exhibition by “slightly settling her false curls and false eyebrows with her fan, and showing her false teeth, set off by her false complexion” (p. 283). Arranged as Cleopatra, she is a kind of canvas, a “figure, painted and patched for the sun to mock, that is drawn slowly through the crowd from day to day” (p. 560). Her daughter seems to her the mere commodity whose beauty she must enhance for a future good buyer. In this regard, she is explicitly connected with Good Mrs. Brown who makes “a sort of property” of her own daughter Alice, then trades her on less advantageous terms to the villainous Carker. Alice bitterly appraises the cost to herself of her own good looks and reproaches her mother: “There was a girl called Alice Marwood. She was handsome....She was too well cared for, too well trained....What came to that girl comes to thousands every year. It was only ruin, and she was born to it.”
There was a criminal called Alice Marwood....And Lord, how the gentlemen in the court talked about it! and how grave the judge was...on her having perverted the gifts of nature—as if he didn’t know better than anybody there, that they had been made curses to her!...” (pp. 468-69). Alice and Edith are fatally linked not only by their hidden blood relationship which comes to light toward the end of the novel, but also by the unnatural transformation of personal gifts into salable goods by their own mothers. This link functions as emphasis on the tragic nature of the trade in Edith. Edith herself intuitively perceives her similarity with Alice upon their first and last encounter: “...she saw upon her face some traces which she knew were lingering in her own soul, if not yet written on that index...” (p. 550). Generally speaking, mothers are thoroughly silenced, denigrated, simply eliminated, or written out of the Victorian fictions. Even if written, they have neither power nor wealth to hand on to their daughters, like Mrs. Skewton and Mrs. Brown. The most they can do is teach their daughters the tricks of surviving in patriarchy by pleasing, and attaching themselves to, powerful and economically viable men. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar in The Madwoman in the Attic see in motherlessness the emblem of female powerlessness in nineteenth-century society. Maternal absence and silence, they argue, rob the heroine of important role models for her development, of the matriarchal power which could facilitate her own growth into womanhood. The assumption is that mothers and daughters can be powerful even within patriarchy if connected with each other. But rather than such a positive view of mother-daughter connection, it can be properly said that mothers prevent daughters from getting the freedom necessary to circumscribe their own developmental course. The heroine Florence might also be transformed into the same kind of commodity as Edith and Alice if her mother Fanny were still alive. Fanny might make her daughter little better than a prostitute. When Florence loses sight of her maid Susan and goes astray, the visionary ogre Mrs. Brown strips her of beautiful clothes and forces her into her own
daughter's rags. Such treatment at her hands signifies the figure of the mother as a procuress. If we see what she has done to Alice, it will be clear that she assumes the role of a procuress. Fanny might also take on the same role. Owing to her death, she can continue to elicit a certain nostalgia from Florence.

When Edith is transformed into a commodity by her own mother as mentioned above, she holds scorn in herself: "...she seemed with her own pride to defy her very self" (p. 288). This feeling, through her conflict with and opposition to her mother who is submissive to patriarchy, grows into her rebellion against patriarchy itself. She cannot endure the absolute master-servant relationship which is demanded by the unyielding and haughty Dombey. She stands against his authority and finally attempts to escape from it. When she breaks off the sales contract one-sidedly by throwing away the ornaments, the dresses, and the deed of settlement, she can stand on an equal footing with him as a human being. Toward the end of the novel, she says in answer to Florence's entreaty, "I will try,...to forgive him his share of blame. Let him try to forgive me mine!" (p. 827). Here we can see in her something of the "new woman" who repudiates the conservative idea that the wife should love, respect, and submit to the husband, her lord and master, and who revolts against her legal and social bondage, demanding equal rights with men.

But however deeply Dickens may sympathize with women's situation, their rebellion is repressed, so that the stability of patriarchal society is restored. It is true that the direct cause of Edith's escape is Dombey's mental cruelty to her and also that she herself denies her sexual relationship with Carker, but Dickens never forgives her, because she deviates from the Victorian middle-class view of home, which is mentioned in Ruskin's "Of Queens' Gardens." Her act of escape means a refusal of the woman's obligation to home, namely, the maintenance and management of home, the place of Peace. Edith must be excluded from England once she openly rejects the figure of "the Household Nun" which emblematizes the ideal wife and mother.
Finally she is again confined to the patriarchal space with Cousin Feenix as a father: "...she may rely on my being, in point of fact, a father to her" (p. 828). In order to reclaim the woman who has rebelled against the central world and deviated from the moral standard, Dickens uses a father however gentle he may be, and makes her submit to him. It is clear that Edith should be demanded to do her loyalty to the patriarchy. In the case of Alice, "the fallen angel" (p. 470), though Dickens sympathizes with her anger and revengeful thought against Carker who bought and discarded her, her final destiny is death. After returning from a penal colony, she is provisionally reabsorbed in society through penitence and sickness, then removed permanently by death. The fallen Alice has no other choice than death even if she has expiated her sin through penitence. In spite of his getting a lot of information on the prostitutes' misery through his social services (from 1847 over ten years to 1858, he took part in the management of Miss Coutts's Cottage which housed not only prostitutes but poverty-stricken women of any other kind), Dickens takes a conservative attitude toward her. Once fallen, she is never accepted by patriarchy. Here we can see its severe double standard against female sexuality.

Unlike Edith, Florence is immuned from the mother's commercialization of the daughter, thanks to Fanny's death. But she herself is portrayed as the ideal daughter-figure of mid-Victorian society. She contributes to its continuation. She is indeed a psychologically complex character whose repressed anger at her father is expressed in the forms of doubles, self-attack, and murderous rage, but more than that, her static, constant, and inviolately innocent character is emphasized as an integral part of her function in the novel. Her inviolate, and by implication inviolable purity never accepts her fallen stepmother Edith who has rebelled against patriarchy and exposed adult sexuality to the world by her elopement with Carker: "'No, no!' cried Florence, shrinking back as she rose up, and putting out her hands to keep her off. 'Mama!'...It was the face of Florence, and through all..."
the terrified avoidance it expressed, there was pity in it, sorrow, a
grateful tender memory. On each face, wonder and fear were painted
vividly; each, so still and silent, looking at the other over the black
gulf of the irrevocable past" (p. 823). The impulses that would bind
Florence to Edith, “pity...sorrow, a grateful tender memory,” are
ironically, but inevitably, precisely those impulses which result in her
“terrified avoidance” of Edith. For her, Edith is an example not to
be emulated. It can be said that Florence enacts the matricide of
Electra in support of patriarchal power. Being confined and submis-
sive to the patriarchal system, she chooses to ally herself with the fa-
ther rather than the mother. She is a daughter of the father. Quite
different from Edith and Alice who
through their rebellion against
their mothers, become rebellious challengers of the paternal system,
she presents a daughter figure as a submissive victim of it.

Therefore Florence has good marketable value in society if not com-
mercialized by Fanny. It is the awareness of this fact that leads
Carker to plan on succeeding to the House by marriage with her after
Paul’s premature death, and Solomon Gills to read Whittington’s good
luck in Walter’s future as early as the day when his nephew begins to
work in the House. Only Dombey cannot calmly gaze at her as a
commodity available for linking the fortunes and social statuses of
two families together. While openly demanding Edith’s submission be-
cause she is a commodity, he resentfully suspects another sexual
otherness Florence to be his domestic antagonist with influence on
Paul, Fanny, and most decisively on Edith(all figures who resist his
greatness). Ruskin, a champion of patriarchy, mentions the man and
woman view of patriarchal middle-class society in the mid-nineteenth
century, that the woman offsets the man’s faults by her differences
from him: “We are foolish, and without excuse foolish, in speaking
of the ‘superiority’ of one sex to the other, as if they could be com-
pared in similar things. Each has what the other has not: each com-
pletes the other, and is completed by the other: they are in nothing
alike.”6 This means that both the man’s strength and sturdiness and
the woman's tenderness and reserve are their inborn characteristics, therefore a housewife must maintain and manage home, the place of comfort. He skillfully insists upon the appropriateness of patriarchy. But Dombey, without such a view, thinks that Florence's womanly influence deprives him of his property such as Paul and Edith who should be devoted to the husband and father-figure: "Who was it who could win his wife as she had won his boy!...Who was it whose least word did what his utmost means could not!" (p. 539). This is because he does not absorb her into the central world and give her a mother role he alone has the power to legitimate, because he angrily rejects that comforting Victorian construct, a de-sexed, nurturing daughter or "little mother" (Florence herself aspires after that role, looking over the window at the father and daughter living opposite to her house). This rejection is caused by his jealousy of whoever might prove important to Paul. Her maternal connection with Paul makes Dombey feel left out all over again, reviving the unwholesome revelation of Fanny's deathbed. She is turned from an irrelevance into a rival. Lynda Zwinger compares the father-daughter relationship of Dombey and Son with those of Dickens's other novels: "A daughter is anomalous in the patriarchal nuclear family. Virtually every other daughter-heroine in the canon occupies a place Dickens fudged especially for her by literally or figuratively removing her mother...or by desexualizing the father figure...in either case, the sexuality inherent in her separate desirable qualities is repressed beneath the sanctified asexuality of the maternal...In Dombey and Son, Dickens comes as close as he ever does to revealing the hollowness of his fictional, and his culture's ideological, daughter alibis." Dombey's rejection immediately brings the dangerous possibilities of father-daughter connection into full focus, and heightens the tension between two. One of those possibilities would be an incestuous relationship. In fact Florence's beauty and her change into adult womanhood give Dombey a secret shock. But more important is that in spite of her loyalty, she seems to him not his "better angel" but a rebel against his paternal
authority. In order to prevent this, he has to include her in the central world and then commercialize her. Left alone outside the boundary, unmanaged or uninvested by him, she threatens the patriarchal household. Though he neglects her with hatred, he feels even the misgivings that Florence may take off his mask to reveal his weakness. This confrontation is Dombey's resistance to the feeling embodied in Florence rather than their struggle. It ends with his defeat when his stubborn phallicism is denied by Edith's escape and the following overthrow of his economic principles, that is, his bankruptcy. The castrated and debilitated father can no longer resist his daughter's sea of feeling when he is directly under her tender influence. He learns to value "hearts" (p. 2) above "hides" (p. 2) and becomes a child again. Just at this moment, in the very triumph of her daughterhood, she becomes a mother-figure like so many of Dickens's daughters. Here the reversed relationship between her and the child-father is established.

But this does not mean that reversed power relationship between men and women which will bring about the collapse of patriarchy. Its continuation is clearly shown in Florence's own speech and behavior. When Edith meets her stepdaughter for the last time, she addresses her as "purest and best of natures" (p. 824). She, the fallen woman and failed mother, confesses to ask forgiveness of Florence, the morally superior daughter, for staining her name. In comparison with that, in the scene of Florence's reconciliation with Dombey, it is not Dombey who has never once been kind to his daughter but Florence, that makes confession and asks forgiveness. She declares herself guilty of running away and of marrying Walter without the paternal blessing. She recognizes herself as the morally inferior because she has not understood her filial duty. Dombey is the superior to whom she must confess. What she attaches much weight to is the fact that she violates the domestic space with unseemly rebellion against its culturally sanctioned power structure. Therefore she stops the overwhelmed, weak Dombey from asking her forgiveness for his sin: "He would have raised his hands and besought her for pardon, but she
caught them in her own, and put them down, hurriedly”(p. 802). It is not to his daughter but to a higher Authority than himself, the Father, that he addresses his request for forgiveness. By attributing Dombey’s downfall to his tyranny and obsessiveness, and then asserting “duty to the father” as the highest of values, the novel indeed reflects not just Dickens’s own ambivalence about fathers but one characteristic of his age. But the established domestic hierarchy with the father at the top is ultimately supported by the daughter herself.

Dombey’s reconfirmed paternal authority is no longer threatened by Florence’s dangerously unregulated emotion. It is partly because he becomes identified with the father-figure that she desired him to be in a family romance, but what is still more important, because at this point in time she is absorbed, through marriage and childbirth, into the domestic hierarchy. She now takes on motherhood as well as daughterhood. Motherhood, for one thing, functions as the agency by which she realizes her filial duty and loyalty to Dombey the authority. She exclaims, “Papa, love, I am a mother. I have a child who will soon call Walter by the name by which I call you. When it was born, and when I knew how much I loved it, I knew what I had done in leaving you. Forgive me, dear Papa!” (p. 802). And moreover, according to Marianne Hirsch, “Motherhood, in Victorian ideology...represents a confinement and potential destruction.” The fact that she gives birth to her son, another little Paul, is also evidence of her absorption. Because it greatly contributes to the reestablishment of “Dombey and Son.” In considering this point, it is significant that he is born on a sea route to China. Florence, probably the first Victorian heroine to sail on a trading venture to China for her honeymoon, says, “My little child was born at sea, Papa” (p. 802). First of all, as is generally known, the sea brings up the image of death when connected with Florence. Even as Florence and Walter sails for the Orient, she recalls the association of the sea with her brother Paul’s death, and Dickens intervenes almost as if to say that Walter, too, is being borne, in marital embrace, toward death (p. 773). But
what is never to be forgot is that the sea functions as a commercial route between England and her colonies. Before their marriage, Florence always identified Walter with “the-man-who-would-understand” in Adrienne Rich’s terms, the man who, unlike the father, would combine maternal nurturance with paternal power—that is, the brother. She expected Walter the brother to offer a refuge from Dombey’s paternal authority. In response to her expectation, incestuous taboo worked on him. After she positively wants him to be her husband and actually gets married, there still remains a brothersister relationship between two. So the incestuous aspect never disappears. But it is also true that marriage incarnates her sexuality. She presents to his eyes a female living body quite contrary to her incorporeal image that the young Walter preserved in his mind as “something precious, unattainable, unchangeable, and indefinite” (p. 216). As the result she can give birth to the far stronger Paul. His birth at sea as a commercial route makes possible Dombey’s fervent desire that the House will continue: “...‘from his daughter, after all, another Dombey and Son will ascend’...‘triumphant!’” (p. 832). It comes to this, that Florence serves as a help to the maintenance of patriarchy.

In the new domestic space which is constructed at the end of the novel, Dombey’s previous masculine oppression is much softened by Florence’s feminine influence. In that sense, Miss Tox’s remark that “‘Dombey and Son,...is indeed a daughter,...after all.’” (p. 803) is proper. But it must also be noticed that this space, which consists both of Florence’s quasi father-daughter relationship with Walter who is her husband, her “brother,” and easily turned into a patriarch, and of her relationship with her real father Dombey, is made in order by the same hierarchy as that of the scene in which Florence confesses to Dombey. This is symbolically shown in his attitude toward his granddaughter little Florence: “He hoards her in his heart” (p. 833). Though he recognizes as valuable the femininity embodied in his daughter, he never appreciates it publicly. Thus Florence, the gravest
threat to the androcentric world, finally has been absorbed into the patriarchal domestic space and placed under restraint. The central world is no longer trespassed upon by women from beyond the boundary.

To sum up, in this novel, mothers consistently submit to patriarchy, except Edith who has no experience of childbirth and nurture. Daughters's opposition to their mothers leads to their rebellion against the established system. But such an attitude is never forgiven. They are deviated from the ideal woman-figure of the Victorian middle-class, and so their fate is negatively settled. The daughter, like Florence, needs not only to obey and please the father in order to bind her to the law but also assume the mother role in his affections. Then she can make flexible with femininity the father's rigid unified domination. This is only useful to prolong patriarchy.

But do not mothers and daughters become a threat to patriarchy? As one way of foreshowing this threat, Dickens connects it with the intrusion of the class otherness, the lower class, into the middle-class world from beyond the borders. Speaking concretely, this connection is represented in the intrusion of the lower-class woman Mrs. Toodle, as a wet-nurse, into the Dombey's. In Dickens's time, the middle and intellectual classes emphasized the significance of maternal breast-feeding from medical and moralistic points of view. Hand-feeding was condemned because it destroyed an infant's health and brought a high death-rate. Therefore in comparison with his brother-in-law Mr. Chick who suggests the artificial-feeding with a teapot, it is wise of the prosperous Dombey to employ a wet-nurse, Polly Toodle, for his son Paul, as the second best policy, just after Fanny's death in childbirth. The problem is, however, that he makes her role a kind of commodity by concluding “what is a mere matter of bargain and sale” (p. 18) with her. He never accepts her sexual superiority shown by breast-feeding and her maternal love for the baby. He even tries to masculinize her by calling her “Richards.” What he has done does not stop here. Because he feels some apprehensions about the lower
class, he forbids her to meet her own family. This frees his mind from the fear that Paul may be socially contaminated by the contact with the lower-class children. But however strict his order may be, there remains the fact that she suckles him. It reminds us of the middle-class belief that through the agency of the wet-nurse, the vulgarities and perversions of the lower class are given physical imprint on the cherished minds and bodies of the middle class, and consequently the borderline between the two classes becomes obscure. This superstitious danger exists so long as Polly breast-feeds Paul. It is ironically owing to Paul’s premature death that the central world can keep its purity.

As another way of foreshowing a mere shell of paternal authority in the middle-class family, Dickens draws the reversed power relationship between father and mother in the lower-class family. The sexually frustrated Mrs. Mac Stinger gets forcibly remarried to Bunsby toward the end of the novel. In marked contrast to many other cases of the novel, it suggests a man’s fate of falling a sacrifice to marriage. In the social situation at that time, the woman’s dependence upon marriage was of use to the continuation of patriarchy. But in the case of this couple, the patriarch becomes no more than a name, and the real domestic power lies in Mrs. Mac Stinger. Captain Cuttle, when he sees her daughter Juliana observing with deadly interest the wedding ceremony, is left prey to horrible matriarchal visions of women’s eternal dominion over men: “The Captain saw in this a succession of man-traps stretching out infinitely; a series of ages of oppression and coercion, through which the seafaring line was doomed” (p. 815). Almost at the same time, as if by common prior consent, Susan, the lower-class woman, enters into the central world by her marriage with Toots. Her intrusion causes the inside to begin showing the signs of change. She, now Mrs. Toots, though romantically consecrated by her husband, establishes matriarchal authority by taking away the domestic leadership from her unreliable husband, and moreover by giving birth to three daughters. This family, quite
contrary to the social system of patriarchy, is virtually one of female
geneology. Florence, Walter, and Dombey constitute the closed patri-
archal space full of maternal love and domesticity, where the children
are suckled by their own mother. But around this space, mothers
more powerful than fathers reduce paternal authority to a mere shell
by effectively ruling their families in league with their daughters.

Because Dickens himself is a typical Victorian middle-class man, he
naturally has his limit in drawing women’s rebellion and expressing
his sympathy for them. It is worth notice, however, first that he re-
represents as victims of the patriarchal system not only Edith and Alice
but also their own mothers, Mrs. Skewton and Mrs. Brown, who are
submissive to patriarchy; secondly that he characterizes even Florence,
the ideal daughter-figure of mid-Victorian society, as filled with re-
pressed anger at her father; lastly that he suggests the reversed power
relationship between fathers and mothers toward the end of the novel
though in brief description. These unassimilated stories diminish the
snug prosperity that is accomplished by erasing the domestic tension
of the Dombey’s. Indeed no other Dickens’s novels call the reader’s att-
tention to women’s situation more strongly than *Dombey and Son*.

Then why did such a novel appear at this very time? In considering
this problem, it is necessary to know that in his earlier novels, except
his “historical” tales, Dickens depicts the temporally inconsistent
worlds where the past and the present mix in confusion, whereas in
*Dombey and Son* he has clear time-sense for the first time and sets
the background in the mid-forties. This is his first novel of contem-
porary life. And it is the railroad that symbolizes that period and
sends away the past as the old world to the “other side of yonder
embarkments.”¹¹ Nina Auerbach sees the railroad of this novel as the
“sphere of the mechanical and masculine rather than the organic and
feminine” and the embodiment of “phallic force” like Dombey.¹² But
I think she so much wishes to grasp everything in the confrontation
between Dombey’s masculinity and Florence’s femininity that her read-
ing simply gives a set of concepts onto the railroad. By pinning its

(971)
development to the power of patriarchy, she diminishes its explosive potential. We have to take notice that the railroad is likened to the monster “Death” qualified with adjectives such as “triumphant” (p. 275), “remorseless,” “indomitable” (p. 276). It tears Carker to pieces and strikes Dombey with terror. Though it may indeed be developed by patriarchy, the railroad has clearly the power of destroying it and does not simply function in its favor. The railroad’s dynamism as it changes everything brings forth to society such uncertainty and agitation as described by Marx in The Communist Manifesto of 1847: “All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air.”

In the 1840s, the convulsionary period typified by the Chartism, Dickens quickly perceived women’s awakening complaints against the status quo to be one phenomenon of the fluidization of established value system. This perception caused his interest in the mother-daughter relationship hitherto excluded as a narrative not to be spoken in favor of the father-daughter relationship under patriarchy. Some of his following novels, for example Bleak House (1852-53) and Hard Times (1854), were to reflect that interest in some form. His perception proved right as time went by. Gradually women ceased to consider it but right to obey passively patriarchy. They grew discontented with the situation where men arbitrarily, according to their sense of value, determined which women should be admitted to the central world and which women should be excluded from it. Women as wives/mothers/daughters had been hitherto a little bird caged up in the home under the authority of husbands/fathers/brothers. But now they proceeded from this situation through a longing for the outer world over the window, to the stage in which they would really go out of the door.
NOTES


5. Exile, emigration, or transportation are the only alternatives, apart from death, Victorian fiction permits the fallen woman. In *David Copperfield* (1849-50), for example, Little Emily is consigned to Australia for life. Dickens’s interest in a project for reclaiming women from the streets and emigrating them as servants, is outlined in his “Home for Homeless Women,” *Household Words* 23 Apr. 1853: 161-75.

6. Ruskin, 121.


8. See Dianne F. Sadoff, *Monsters of Affection: Dickens, Eliot & Brontë on Fatherhood* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1982) 55, on the idea of the family as devouring all other social institutions. Sadoff also describes “Victorian ambivalence about...paternal authority: the desire for its stability, decisiveness, and cultural validity side by side with the hatred of its narrowness, stubbornness, and social domination—oppression—of those without such authority” (6).


