

**THE MYSTERIES OF UDOLPHO: ANN RADCLIFFE'S "GOTHIC" EUTOPIA¹
FOR THE FEMALE OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY**

Ertuğrul KOÇ

Doç. Dr., Mütercim-Tercümanlık Bölümü Anabilim Dalı Başkanı, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Çankaya Üniversitesi, Ankara, Türkiye, E-mail: ekoc@cankaya.edu.tr

Özge GÜVENÇ

Okutman, Yabancı Diller Birimi, Bölüm Dışı Dersler Koordinatörlüğü, Çankaya Üniversitesi, Ankara, Türkiye, E-mail: ozgeguvenc@cankaya.edu.tr

ABSTRACT: If interpreted from the historical, Marxist, and feminist viewpoints, Ann Radcliffe in *The Mysteries of Udolpho* can be said to have depicted the historical progression from the feudal to the capitalist order, with the position of woman in this transformation constituting the central theme of the novel. Radcliffe sees the old system as a form of *Apollonian* (rational and well-organized) order, while she associates the new system with the *Dionysian* (irrational and chaotic) disorder. In such an *outopia* (nowhere and everywhere), Emily, the "virtuous" protagonist, and the other "good" characters represent the established feudal system, while the "evil" antagonist Montoni and his band stand for the burgeoning capitalism of the eighteenth century and its rough destructiveness. Though Radcliffe puts emphasis on the triumph of the old over the new system at the end, her solution fails, for Emily, the protagonist of the novel, remains stereotypically flat, for she cannot be more than a "helpless maiden" who still needs the protection and support of a male in her male-dominated society. Hence, Radcliffe fails to create for her audience a self-reliant revolutionary female character and, by extension, a better paradigm in support of the female identity.

Keywords: Radcliffe, *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, capitalism, feudalism, patriarchy

**UDOLPHONUN GİZEMLERİ: ONSEKİZİNCİ YÜZYIL KADINI İÇİN ANN RADCLIFFE'İN ÖNERDİĞİ
UYSA "GOTİK" KÜLTÜR**

ÖZET: Tarihsel, Marksist, ve feminist bakış açıları ile yorumladığımızda, Ann Radcliffe'in *Udolpho'nun Gizemleri* adlı romanında, tarihin feodal sistemden kapitalist düzene ilerleme sürecinde kadının durumunu ana tema yaparak, bu geçiş dönemini tasvir ettiği söylenebilir. Radcliffe eski sistemi *Apollonian* (yani akıl ve uyum) olarak kabul ederken, yeni düzeni de *Dionysian* (yani içgüdü ve karmaşa) ile bağdaştırmıştır. Yazarın yarattığı *outopia*'da (olmayan yer) ana karakter Emily ve diğer iyi karakterler yerleşik feodalitenin doğrularını temsil ederken, Montoni ve arkadaşları ise onsekizinci yüzyılın gelişmekte olan kapitalizmini ve bu yapının yıkıcılığını anlatmaktadır. Romanın sonunda eski sistemin yeni düzene karşı kazandığı zaferin üzerinde önemle durulmasına rağmen, Radcliffe'in önerdiği çözüm tatmin edici değildir; çünkü ana kahraman Emily basmakalıp bir karakter olarak kalmış, aidiyet hissettiği erkek-egemen toplumda halen bir erkeğin korumasına muhtaç, savunmasız bir genç kız tiplemesinden öteye gidememiştir. Bu yüzden Radcliffe, kendine güveni yüksek, devrimci bir karakter yaratamamış ve dolayısıyla kadın kimliğini koruyup destekleyen daha gelişmiş bir kültürel yapıyı eserinde ortaya koyamamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Radcliffe, *Udolpho'nun Gizemleri*, kapitalizm, feodalizm, ataerkillik

Introduction

The Mysteries of Udolpho has hardly been taken as a work demonstrating the social, cultural, and historical aura of its time. Instead, it was interpreted as an exemplar contributing, in terms of the atmospheric devices, to the establishment of the gothic genre after Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto*. Radcliffe's work, however, is more than that: other than creating the gothic atmosphere and the strong sense of suspense which form the basis of any gothic work, she introduces her audience to the vital social problems of her time such as the fall of aristocracy, the property rights of women and the problem of usurpation, and the emerging bourgeois ideology with its material aspect of life. Radcliffe sees all these as threats to the established system, and especially to the woman of her society. Hence, a close reading of her text will reveal the author's interest in the social issues of her time and in the position of woman in this paradigmatic shift from the feudal to the capitalist system.

Radcliffe wrote her novels between 1780 and 1790, the decade which corresponds with the revolutionary movements such as the Industrial, American, and French revolutions which challenged the *status quo* in the West through altering the socio-political systems and threatening, meanwhile, the monarchic form of governments, the class structure, and the way of life. All these drives paved the way for a transition from the old mercantilist order to the new capitalist system, indeed a very painful process for European societies, for there emerged the duality between the past and the present, forming new social norms, behaviors, and opinions. Under the influence of these revolutionary movements, in her novel, *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, Radcliffe depicts a changing world where the old and new paradigms are in perpetual clash. She creates an *outopia*² in which the polarized characters from the two opposing realms (the ancient and the modern) through whose reaction patterns the author expresses her worldview for the restoration of the old by discarding the new. Although Radcliffe gives particular importance to the old "civilized" world as opposed to the new "uncivilized" one, she fails to create an interaction between the two worlds. In *Udolpho* the old paradigm seems to have emerged victorious at the end. Yet, such a restoration is quite unacceptable if the whole story, with its sublimity developed around the uncivilized paradigm, is taken into consideration.

¹ Greek word "eutopia," mean[s] "good place." See *A Handbook to Literature* (Harmon & Holman, 1996: 535).

² The word utopia is a pun on the Greek "outopia," meaning "no place." See *A Handbook to Literature* (Harmon & Holman, 1996: 535).

Through introducing two different realms (civilized and uncivilized), and through creating characters in the fictitious, faux medieval settings such as Italy and France, who, in fact, stand for both the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy, Radcliffe suggests the actual clash of the classes in her country in the eighteenth century, triggering, meanwhile, the fears of her audience concerning Catholicism for gothic culminations. Radcliffe, however, is not impartial about the clash. For her, the old, aristocratic paradigm is the true civilized world, whereas the new capitalist order is the uncivilized paradigm, which is about to defeat the old, the civilized one. Hence, by making the old and new paradigms clash in the novel, she depicts both the aristocratic desire for hegemony and restoration of order, and the bourgeois greed for more wealth and power as opposing cultures. Although the clash between the two ends with the victory of “aristocratic order”, this “feminine” solution is a sour one.

Taking into consideration the motives of the author, and putting emphasis on the eighteenth century paradigm, we will, in this article, attempt to evaluate Radcliffe’s *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, in which the “civilized” and “uncivilized” worlds collide with each other, from the historical, Marxist, and feminist perspectives. These approaches will help us analyze the progression of history from the feudal to the capitalist system with “money” and “masculinity” starting to occupy centrality in Radcliffe’s age. Making use of these approaches, we will also show that Radcliffe, as an outstanding gothic romancer of her age, was able to comprehend the emergence of the capitalist system, but was unable to offer a solution for the forthcoming clash of the new with the old: seeing the emergence of the new order as a threat against the established system, and unable to understand the paradigmatic shift and the cultural schism, Radcliffe, by assuming a conservative tonality, insists on aristocratic hegemony for the preservation of the old and hardly makes any contribution to the improvement of the female identity in the late eighteenth century.

The Clash of the Apollonian and Dionysian Powers in *Udolpho*

The Mysteries of Udolpho is about Emily St. Aubert, the sentimental aristocratic girl brought up in a rural ancestral home of La Vallee by her loving parents, Madame and Monsieur St. Aubert. Having been raised by caring and protective parents, she does not know much about the outside world, and this makes her an anodyne and unengaging “refined” character.³ Since she lives in a world of isolation, she satisfies her curiosity for the mundane world not through real-life experiences, but through her readings of literature which has contributed more to her sentimental nature. She cannot struggle to achieve her independence and determine her own fate because her attitudes and behaviors stem from her willingness to act in accordance with the norms of the aristocratic patriarchy. And the conflict in the story is initiated when she is taken from the protective, feminine world of La Vallee, to the harsh, masculine world of Udolpho, where she encounters villainy, cruelty, and suffering.

Emily’s removal from her pastoral home which is “the epitome of the idealized private world of selflessness and benign relations . . . is set in opposition to the public realm of self-interest, male conflict and aggression” (Kilgour, 1995: 117). Taken to the castle of Udolpho, there she is introduced to the uncivilized world dominated by the rough masculine authority of Montoni. Radcliffe, by introducing this charismatic but villainous character and his uncivilized world, refers to the burgeoning capitalist system in the eighteenth century world. In the novel, Udolpho castle and the usurper in it play allegorical roles, helping Radcliffe suggest the approaching danger for the established paradigm, represented by Emily, her father, Valancourt, and their collaborators. By using these contrasting worlds and having Emily move from her sheltered and sedate world of La Vallee to the dangerous world of Udolpho, Radcliffe depicts her female character as experiencing a change, a transition from the sentimental world of childhood “heaven” to the capitalist “hell” of adulthood.

To elaborate on her transition from the old civilized world to the new uncivilized one, the terms, Apollonian and Dionysian can be used as metaphors to describe these opposing realms.⁴ Radcliffe deliberately creates the two contrasting settings so that she can describe the “feminine” and “masculine” worldviews, which “can also be seen as expressions of the Apollonian and Dionysian worlds” (Koç, 2005: 94). The Apollonian is the feminine world representing the sentimental culture as opposed to the Dionysian, the masculine world representing power and authority. She depicts the feminine world of St. Aubert and his family, and the masculine capitalist world of Montoni and his friends in order to represent the social, cultural, and economic schisms in the eighteenth century. Emily, in the Apollonian world, though patriarchal, was leading a happy life, and was esteemed by her parents. Yet, in the Dionysian world, “the women will not go against the laws and traditions of the patriarchy; it is better to brave the possibility of rape, ruin, and death at the hands of the villains [rather than] betray the duty of a good daughter by disobeying the institutional law of the father” (Bondhus, 2010: 27). Emily, in the Dionysian world, is forced to act in accordance with the rules of capitalist patriarchy, and her commitment to social and moral values brings about her difficulties at Udolpho, a place to confront Montoni and to struggle against his “evil” intentions.

Through the depiction of naïve Emily moving from the aristocratic patriarchy to the capitalist masculinity, Radcliffe, in fact, highlights the legal male-control on the female in the eighteenth century Britain. In fact, “in terms of political and civil rights [for women], the period from the late eighteenth century to the early nineteenth century was one of no progress; indeed there is evidence that the property rights of widows and married women actually declined during this period. There were few anonymous publications protesting against this legal state of affairs . . .” (O’Brian, 2010: 9). True, Radcliffe’s novel demonstrates such a decline in the rights of women in the late eighteenth century. Yet, by making the old established order triumphant over the new capitalist system at the end, she demonstrates her pro-aristocratic stance in the novel in terms of the care and kindness this class demonstrates for its female members. For Radcliffe, the lesser of two evils is the deep-rooted aristocratic male order, since it is

³ Radcliffe, to make Emily a more recognizable figure to her bourgeois reader, also depicts her as a typical eighteenth century middle class girl whose sensibility, delicacy, and curiosity leads her to difficulties in life.

⁴ These two opposing terms are used by Friedrich Nietzsche, in *The Birth of Tragedy*, to designate contrasting elements in Greek Tragedy. “Apollo, the god of youth and light, stood for reason, culture, and moral rectitude. Dionysus, the god of wine, stood for the irrational and undisciplined” (Harmon&Holman, 1996: 35).

much better when compared to the new capitalist system: she sees aristocracy as quite feminized and tamed, and she perceives the new capitalist paradigm as an actual, devastating threat to the (property) rights of women. Hence, she deliberately depicts Emily as a female who finally takes the control of her property, and marries the aristocratic man of her dreams. However, what Radcliffe ignores is the fact that Emily will again have a submissive role in her relation to her husband who has lost all his property, and whose innocence has been spoiled in the capitalist world of Paris.

In Radcliffe's portrayal, Emily is inexperience personified. For the first time, Emily sees the outside world with her father when they go on a trip and meet on the way the sentimental hero, Valancourt, with whom she immediately falls in love. Similarly, he is depicted as a sentimental figure with an "intellectual" mind and a literary taste. Both Emily and Valancourt are unaware of their own naiveté. They know nothing about usurpation, materialism, and greedy people. Emily's father, St. Aubert, is a stereotypical caring parent dominated by aristocratic morality, who wishes the best for her daughter: he has already given her "a general view of the sciences, and an exact acquaintance with every part of elegant literature. He taught her Latin and English; chiefly that she might understand the sublimity of their best poets" (Radcliffe, 2008: 6). Having given his daughter a sentimental education, he also warns her not to become the victim of her emotions, recommends her "to strengthen her mind" to resist "the first impulses of her feelings" (Radcliffe, 2008: 5), and to be a good daughter and wife for men. Aware of the importance of gaining control over emotions through reason, and experienced enough to understand the differences between the old and the new worlds, he knows the fact that he is too late to warn her daughter about the potential dangers. When he reads the letters from M. Quesnel, which notifies the loss of his estates except La Valle and his low income, St. Aubert feels sorry for Emily, and is worried about her future life. However,

Emily smile[s] tenderly upon him through her tears, and [says:] 'do not grieve for me, or for yourself; we may yet be happy. . . we shall not feel the want of those luxuries, which others value so highly, since we never had a taste for them; and poverty cannot deprive us of many consolations [such as] of intellectual delights, of the comfort of affording me examples of fortitude and benevolence, of the delight of consoling a beloved parent' (Radcliffe, 2008: 59-60).

This scene shows how Emily, as a sentimental girl, lives in her isolated world of "happiness" without the awareness of the materialistic side of life. In this sense, St. Aubert is not able to give any direction to his daughter because the norms by which Emily has been brought up, and the norms of the flourishing capitalist world will not be in harmony.

By introducing these sentimental characters, Radcliffe demonstrates her opinion that the old paradigm, the established civilized world which is the product of Renaissance and its humanism, is in decline. If such a paradigm is lost, and if such refined characters are left to the cruel hands of the emerging greedy bourgeois characters, this will mark the end of the "civilized" world. Using the gothic machinery and the atmosphere of terror while describing the capitalist paradigm, and making the sentimental character Emily come from a peaceful, pastoral home, Radcliffe, through the depiction of Emily's struggle to survive in the new order, demonstrates both the decline of aristocracy with their respectable values, and the rise of bourgeoisie with their avarice and immorality.

Capitalist System versus the Feudal Order

After her father's death, Emily is placed under the care of her aunt, Mme Cheron. Montoni, her new husband is the wicked "aristocratic" figure, but with the aspirations of rising middle class people. In fact, Radcliffe creates such a character to depict the spirit of capitalism: Montoni and his friends are all usurpers belonging to the new paradigm. The leader of the masculine band (Montoni) is depicted as "a man about forty, of an uncommonly handsome person, with features manly and expressive, but whose countenance exhibited, upon the whole, more of the haughtiness of command, and the quickness of discernment, than of any other character" (Radcliffe, 2008: 23). Radcliffe also depicts him as a relentless and selfish man of power for he is "the sole arbiter of justice" in the novel, and "is concerned with male exploitation of economically defenseless women" (Howells, 1995: 49). He has large gambling debts to pay off, and threatens his wife in order to make her sign over the estates to himself. His fearsome reputation derives not only from his physical strength or social position, but also from his mental abilities. Hence, this man is the new individual who does not interpret the family relation as something sacred. Instead, he acts as a typical middle class man who is hungry for money and success.

In *The Communist Manifesto*, the philosophers Marx and Engels state that "the bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation" (2008: 6). Having thus depicted the capitalist family structure, the two thinkers see how the new economic relations have penetrated into the family unit. Their ideas about the capitalist economic order and the family structure can be applied to the conflict in Radcliffe's novel. In this sense, Montoni, as the representative of the new bourgeois paradigm, and playing the roles of bourgeois husband and father in the novel, has already "torn away the sentimental veil" (6), and has come to construct with two women (Emily and Mme Cheron) "money relation[s]" (6). He shows no pity while keeping his wife and niece in closed chambers in Udolpho castle, since his chief aim is to make money and property. Marx also asserts that "the bourgeois [husband] sees his wife as a mere instrument of production. He hears that the instruments of production are to be exploited in common, and, naturally, can come to no other conclusion that the lot of being common to all will likewise fall to the women" (20). Radcliffe criticizes Montoni for his opportunism, for the other greedy bourgeois aspirations, and for the violence he practices on the weak (female) characters.

Similarly, Mme Cheron is also depicted as a selfish, cruel, and materialistic woman who lacks any female decorum and sensibility. Despite being a woman and coming from aristocratic background, she has typical masculine attitudes. In fact, after the death of her father, Emily's new parents are the two "patriarchal" figures, representing the new masculine capitalist order. Mme Cheron, like Montoni, is after worldly possessions. Her only concern is to get power through money and estates, which is a typical middle class aspiration. A self-centered and socially ambitious figure who gives little attention to the needs and feelings

of the others, she charges Emily with misconduct upon the discovery of Valancourt's letter sent to her niece, saying "if you are not contented to conform to my directions, and to my way of life, I shall give up the task of overlooking your conduct – I shall no longer trouble myself with your education, but shall send you to board in a convent" (Radcliffe, 2008: 125). She is very cold and insensitive, demonstrating the reaction patterns of a middle class father, and torments Emily whenever she finds the opportunity. In fact, she has already adopted herself to the norms of the new socio-economic system. By depicting Montoni and Mme Cheron from the pseudo aristocracy as the representatives of the capitalist system, Radcliffe covertly criticizes middle class people and their capitalist paradigm.

In order to understand the reason why Radcliffe seems to be in favor of the old civilized feudal order as opposed to the new uncivilized capitalist system, the Marxist theory of historical materialism is applicable to Radcliffe's worlds. In *The German Ideology*, Marx claims that "the social structure and the State are continually evolving out of the life-process of definite individuals . . . as they operate, produce materially, and hence as they work under definite material limits, presuppositions and conditions independent of their will" (1970: 47). Marx puts emphasis on the "material aspect" of life such as production and labor, which lead to social changes in societies. To put it differently, the way a society produces and distributes its wealth determines its social and political structure. Therefore, Marx asserts that

The production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is at first directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men, the language of real life. . . Morality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. They have no history, no development; but men, developing their material production and their material intercourse alter, along with their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking. Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life (1970: 47).

Marx and Engels believe that throughout history people have had a voice in the creation and management of their own lives in accordance with the modes of production they are involved in. Naturally, such an interaction requires a class based social system, and the two philosophers see that what we call history is the total sum of class conflicts: "the organized power of one class for oppressing another" (Tucker, 1969: 66). For them

each successive epoch in the social history of mankind, each dominant socioeconomic formation, has its own characteristic form of statehood. On that basis there should be five different forms of government corresponding to the five forms of class society: Asiatic society, the slave owning society of classical antiquity, feudal society, modern bourgeois society, and future communist society . . . (66).

They indicate that after the feudal stage comes the "modern bourgeois society" which corresponds with the age of revolutions in Europe. The development of the material conditions, and accordingly, the creation of new classes with their ideologies were the phenomena of the eighteenth century, affecting all classes and their intellectuals and artists respectively.

Radcliffe was the author of the pre and post-revolution periods. As an intellectual and artist she must have observed the emergence of the new (greedy) social classes with their new, antimonarchist, anti-feudal ideologies. As the emergence of each new epoch is painful especially for the established system and its representatives, Radcliffe's conservative antagonism to the new system is understandable. Yet, this change is unavoidable, and this is what Radcliffe cannot accept. She insists that the old is precious and should be kept as it is. Having confined herself into the "cozy" feudal order of the past, she laments for the emergence of the new capitalist world, and *uses* the "woman question" to strengthen her stance against the new. That is why; Emily's victory at the end is quite sour.

Radcliffe's World in Transition from the "Moral" to the "Immoral"

Radcliffe's *Udolpho* depicts a world in transition from feudalism to capitalism. In either system, there are two classes, the ruling and the ruled, the oppressor and the oppressed, always in struggle against each other in terms of gaining material and political power. On the one hand, Radcliffe valorizes the old doctrines of the mercantilist system, on the other; she cannot ignore the emerging system and its impact on all classes. She depicts the rise of the bourgeoisie through Montoni, who tries to usurp the power and property of the old feudal order represented by St. Aubert and his family. As a result of the interaction and strife between these two opposing classes and their economic systems, the capitalist system wins power over the feudal order.

Marx and Engels, in this respect, highlight the significance of classes in history in *The Communist Manifesto*, and show that history progresses through conflict:

The history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, . . . a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary re-constitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes (2008: 3).

A class, in fact, develops through economic forces, and during this process, a superstructure, the body politics of a society creating its own norms and values, is formed. With respect to the idea of class struggle, and forming the superstructure, Radcliffe criticizes the new bourgeois characters and their values since the new paradigm is the cause of the collapse of aristocracy and its refined values. As the products of the new paradigm, the pseudo aristocratic Montoni and Mme Cheron's class ideology can be explained through Terry Eagleton's interpretation of Marx:

Relations of production form what Marx calls 'the economic structure of society,' or what is more commonly known by Marxism as the economic 'base' or 'infrastructure'. From this economic base, in every period, emerges a 'superstructure' - certain forms of law and politics, a certain kind of state whose essential function is to legitimate the power of the social class which owns the means of economic production (1976: 5).

With the help of the conflicts between the characters from the old and new paradigms, Radcliffe draws the attention to the social panorama of her age through which the base of the new capitalist order is revealed. She demonstrates how these two worlds contradict with each other in terms of religious, social, and political values, and shows the interaction between the forming of the economic base and the culture. Thus, Marx's concept of class ideology is of great help to understand Radcliffe's stance in the novel since "a new class is always a source of emergent culture" (Williams, 1977: 124). As a conventional author, Radcliffe insists on the traditional (or feudal) way of life, yet she cannot disregard the impact of the Industrial Revolution on the society which has already created greedy characters like Montoni and his friends, the embodiment of the new capitalist system.

Depicting Montoni as an evil usurper with many tricks, Radcliffe associates this figure with the hypocritical, capitalist culture of her age, and Radcliffe's depiction of the age through Montoni brings to mind Niccolò Machiavelli's *The Prince*⁵ where Machiavelli states that authority and power essentially have the same standing before the law and whoever has power has the right to command. Thus, "a prince must know how to make use of the nature of the beast, he should choose from among the beasts the fox and the lion: . . . It is therefore necessary to be a fox, in order to recognize the traps, and a lion, in order to frighten the wolves:" (2008: 60). With respect to this definition, Montoni can be considered a Machiavellian figure deceiving Mme Cheron and Emily like a "fox", and forcing them like a "lion" to sign over the estates by keeping them as prisoners at Udolpho. As the narrative voice comments, "He had, of course, many and bitter enemies; but the rancour of their hatred proved the degree of his power; and, as power was his chief aim, he gloried more in such hatred, than it was possible he could in being esteemed" (Radcliffe, 2008: 182). Similar to Machiavelli's idea that "love endures by a bond which men, being scoundrels, may break whenever it serves to their advantage to do so; but fear is supported by the dread of pain, which is ever present" (65), Montoni's "supremacy" comes from his cruel treatment toward his wife and niece. Since his ultimate goal is to increase his money and property through usurpation, he requires the obedience of the women under his control. To achieve this, he keeps them in closed chambers, and even goes to the extent of torturing them. Blinded by his ambition to gain material power, he behaves in such a cruel way that alters the relations among the family members. For instance, in response to Emily's inquiries about her aunt, he says, "She suffers by her own folly, and is not to be pitied; - she knows how she may avoid these sufferings in future - if she is removed to the turret, it will be her own fault. Let her be obedient, and sign the writings you heard of, and I will think no more of it" (Radcliffe, 2008: 307). From the depiction of Radcliffe on how bourgeoisie came to increase their money and property, how they acquired social and political power, and how they changed (or turned upside-down) the established order, it may be deduced that Montoni, as an egotistic bourgeois individual, is eager to exploit the passive ones, the women.

Through the relation between the exploiter and the exploited, Radcliffe also discusses in the novel the vital changes in the familial and the sexual bonds between man and woman. When she wrote *Udolpho*, in the patriarchal system of England, marriage had already become a commercial matter. Upper middle class families expected their daughters to marry the men from noble families since women had no legal rights as well as freedom to sustain their own lives. Hence, economic status of the would-be husband played a vital role in being chosen as the appropriate bridegroom. This was, however, quite ironic because once married, the bride became the property of her rich husband.

Simone de Beauvoir, in *The Second Sex*, states the historical development of women's position in the institution of marriage:

[In the Middle Ages] the unmarried or widowed woman had all the rights of man; . . . but in the case of married women subordination remained useful to society. . . . When the bourgeoisie awoke, it followed the same laws; . . . from feudal times to our days the married woman has been deliberately sacrificed to private property. The richer the husband, the greater the dependence of the wife; the more powerful he feels socially and economically, the more authoritatively he plays the paterfamilias The code denied women access to 'masculine' positions, deprived her of all civil capacities, kept her, while unmarried under the guardianship of her father, who sent her into a convent if she failed to marry later, and if she did marry put her and her property and children completely under her husband's authority (1956: 123-124).

Similarly, Radcliffe depicts Emily as an unmarried young girl whose historical development starts with her removal from the protection of her father to the guardianship of her so called father, Montoni. However, the only difference between the two father figures is related to the paradigms they represent: although Radcliffe depicts St Aubert as a caring and protective father in the old feudal order, and Montoni as a cruel oppressor in the new capitalist system, she still depicts and offers paternal authorities to Emily. In addition, she marries Valancourt to surrender herself to her husband after her struggles in *Udolpho* castle, which demonstrates the author's wish to keep Emily as a flat character in the masculine order

Because Emily is a stereotypical (and therefore submissive) eighteenth century heroine, she shows no reaction to male authority. Always repressing her wishes, she accepts the limitations and rules imposed upon her by Mme Cheron and Montoni. When they do not let her marry Valancourt, she refuses Valancourt's marriage proposal despite all her sorrow:

⁵ Having been regarded as one of the greatest works in history as a political guidebook for the ruling of autocratic regimes, *The Prince* has contributed to the transition from medieval scholasticism to Renaissance humanism, and influenced the political thought of the world.

The conflict she had suffered, between love and the duty she at present owed to her father's sister; her repugnance to a clandestine marriage, her fear of emerging on the world with embarrassments, . . . all this various interest was too powerful for a mind, already enervated by sorrow, and her reason had suffered a transient suspension. But duty, and good sense, however hard the conflict, at length, triumphed over affection and mournful presentiment (Radcliffe, 2008: 155).

Although Mme Cheron and Montoni are the embodiments of the "uncivilized" capitalist order, Emily confines herself to the wills of her aunt and uncle because for her there is no way out other than obedience to the patriarchal norms.

Having discovered the financial truth about Mme Cheron, Montoni "who had been allured by the seeming wealth of Madame Cheron, was now severely disappointed by her comparative poverty, and highly exasperated by the deceit she had employed to conceal it, till concealment was no longer necessary" (Radcliffe, 2008: 190). Similarly, Mme Cheron thinks that "[Montoni] has deceived [her] in every respect; and now he has taken [her] from [her] country and friends, to shut [her] up in this old castle; and he thinks he can compel [her] to do whatever he designs!" (Radcliffe, 2008: 280). She is also disappointed about the fact that "a man of his family and apparent wealth had absolutely no fortune" (2008: 280). With these confessions, Radcliffe shows the hypocrisy in the burgeoning capitalist world represented by Mme Cheron and Montoni. As an ambitious materialistic man, Montoni never gives up and does everything to get the estates that belong to Mme Cheron. He imprisons her and says "you shall be removed to the east turret: there, perhaps, you may understand the danger of offending a man, who has an unlimited power over you" (2008: 305). As a middle class member of the male-dominated society, Montoni demonstrates his masculine power over Mme Cheron.

Not only Mme Cheron, but also Emily pass through the same stages and suffer from the torments of Montoni. Although Mme Cheron and Emily are depicted as the embodiment of different worlds, the new capitalist system and the old feudal order, they are women, and they are expected to act in accordance with the rules of the male-dominated society, for a woman in a patriarchal system "finds herself living in a world where men can compel her to assume the status of the Other. They propose to stabilize her as object and to doom her to immanence" (Beauvoir, 1956: 27). As the tyrannical treatment of Montoni towards women implies, he treats Emily and her aunt as if they were his possessions. He shows no mercy, no sympathy, and no morality. "[He] is marked as possessing an aggressive masculinity that contrasts pointedly with that of St. Aubert and Valancourt in being not only distinct from but also hostile to women, whom he regards only as a means to or form of disposable property" (Johnson, 1995: 103). For him, women are only commodities to be exploited, bought, and sold. They are the sexually treated objects, and thus inferior to men. To illustrate, in "a party of cavaliers" (Radcliffe, 2008: 311), he expects both his wife and niece to sit at the head of the table, and commands Emily to "wear the most splendid dress she had. . . [and sit] between [two of the cavaliers who have] an expression of wild fierceness, of subtle design, or of licentious passions" (Radcliffe, 2008: 311-312). In fact, Emily is being displayed by Montoni to the gaze of his friends as his possession, which represents his attitude towards women. On another occasion, he behaves like a typical middle class father, and husband, and tells Emily to "learn and practice the virtues, which are indispensable to a woman – sincerity, uniformity of conduct and obedience" (Radcliffe, 2008: 270), and thus tries to sell his "daughter" for maintaining his financial power. Therefore, he introduces Emily to Count Morano, and forces her to marry him, demonstrating the vision of life that represents the traditional worldview of the bourgeois society in the eighteenth century Europe.

In order to juxtapose the differences between the civilized and the uncivilized realms, Radcliffe, on purpose, uses the castle and makes Emily and Montoni, female and male confront each other. On the one hand, the castle represents the old feudal system of the Middle Ages; on the other, it is ruled by a stereotypical middle class man whose sole interest lies in maintaining more material wealth. Montoni is the modern, possessive, and opportunistic individual motivated by the riches of the mundane world, whereas Emily is the sentimental, passive, yet refined character who cares for feminine decorum, and who gives importance to the social and moral values of the order she belongs to. The castle is the central setting symbolizing villainy, masculinity, and cruelty, oppressing and exploiting the weak. By depicting a faux-medieval setting, Radcliffe provides, in fact, an "outopia", the only place for Emily and Montoni to be themselves, and settle accounts with each other. In the clash between the aristocratic and capitalist worlds, the castle plays a significant role, providing a "nowhere" where the anxieties of an age spring up. Despite the power of the new uncivilized paradigm, Radcliffe makes Emily win the battle. As a result, she escapes from the castle and ends up marrying a sentimental hero: Valancourt. By letting Emily marry the man of her choice, Radcliffe provides both for herself and for her character, a wish-fulfillment that feminine values and aristocratic morality will overcome vulgar masculinity.

Conclusion

Consequently, by having the two opposing worlds, the old feudal order and the new capitalist system confront each other; Radcliffe depicts the social panorama of the late eighteenth century England as a time of great conflict. Through the central characters (Emily and Montoni) and through the relation between the oppressor and the oppressed, she highlights the painful process of transition for the females of this world. Although she is aware of the social developments *and* the subsequent problems such as the rise of bourgeoisie, class struggle, and property rights, she turns a deaf ear to the emergence of the ruthlessly pragmatic capitalist ideology which will eventually crush the weak members of society and destroy the female identity. In favor of the aristocratic hegemony and its "refined" values, she laments for the fall of this paradigm, and for the replacement of the old order with the new one. Though Radcliffe's realization of the secondary role of the female is detected in her work when she criticizes the corruption of familial relations and the unfair social position the women of her age occupy, she matures neither her major character nor the theme of her novel for better ends. Having created the Apollonian and Dionysian worlds as metaphors to discuss the socio-economic and socio-political structures of her time together with the position of women in this schismatic transition, she unfortunately fails to find and offer a rational and satisfying solution for the characterlessness of the female in the eighteenth century masculine paradigm. She limits her criticism with the paradigmatic shift and with the usurpation of the

bourgeoisie of the rights of aristocracy, and with the loss of morality. As these opposing polarities are masculine in essence, there is no place for women in these “respectable” worlds.

RESOURCES

- Beauvoir, Simone de. (1956). *The Second Sex*. Trans. H. M. Parshley. Great Britain: Lowe & Brydone.
- Bondhus, C. (2010). Sublime Patriarchs and the Problems of the New Middle Class in Ann Radcliffe’s *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and *The Italian*. *Gothic Studies*, 12(1), 13-29.
- Eagleton, T. (1976). *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. London: Methuen & Co.Ltd.
- Elster, J. (1986) *An Introduction to Karl Marx*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harmon, W., Holman, C.H. (Eds.). (1996). *A Handbook to Literature*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Howells, C.A. (1995). *Love, Mystery, and Misery*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Johnson, C.L. (1995). *Equivocal Beings*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Koç, E. (2005). *Birth of English Novel*. Ankara: Çankaya University Publications.
- Kilgour, M. (1995). *The Rise of the Gothic Novel*. London: Routledge.
- Machiavelli, N. (2008). *The Prince*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2008). *The Communist Manifesto*. London: Wordsworth Editions Limited.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1970). *The German Ideology*. in C. J. Arthur (ed.), New York: International Publishers.
- O’Brian, K. (2010) *Women and Enlightenment in Eighteenth Century Britain*. New York: Cambridge
- Radcliffe, A. (2008). *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tucker, Robert C. (1969). *The Marxian Revolutionary Idea*. London: Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.

This page intentionally left blank.