

Shape Which Shape Had None
The Mother/Daughter Plot in *Jane Eyre*

TSUNODA Nobue

I

The last chapter of *Jane Eyre* begins with the narrator's triumphant declaration, "Reader, I married him" (XXXVIII, 395). In this the narrator tells two things at once : that her romantic love is consummated and that she finally becomes a speech subject. Here two quite contradictory paradigms in patriarchal society meet — a female family romance and a female Bildungsroman.

That the latter is an almost unattainable model in the mid-nineteenth century England in which patriarchy holds sway becomes clear just when the oedipal origin of the plot is examined. In the case of a male subject, the Freudian family romance serves as a model for the Bildungsroman ; in Lacanian terminology, it can be phrased as a dramatization of the process by which a subject separating from m (other), mother as other, finally attains his manhood when he gains the symbolic power of speech in submission to Law or the Name-of-the-Father. With a female subject, however, the Freudian oedipal paradigm shall never create the conditions for a female Bildungsroman, for it only reproduces another m (other) who is deprived of words. A daughter separating herself from m (other) finds herself at a loss to discover a mother figure on which she can model herself. In building a speech subject, she must grope her way into another origin of plot, a mother/daughter paradigm not yet formed as an independent plot in the mid-nineteenth century society where the Name-of-the-Mother has been delegitimated and effaced.

In *Jane Eyre*, although it has no power to drive forth the surface plot, the mother/daughter paradigm serves as a counter-plot and works to subvert the coercive oedipal origin of the plot. Throughout the narrative framework, the heroine's happiness is represented in terms of her consummating the Western myth of romantic love generated through the fundamentally oedipal fantasy ; but just behind such a narrative framework, the duality of Jane's " I " works effectively in introducing " a 'story' very different from the tale told by the governess/narrator" that "keeps rising up from below the surface of the text" (Kloepfer 43).

Let us note that Jane the heroine's " I " is not just identical with Jane the narrator's " I ". Until the narrator reveals in the final chapter that she has now been married with Rochester for ten years, the narrative technique of "the just-after-present" as Kathleen Tillotson terms it (298) functions to conceal the duality of the " I "; but the fissure can be seen in some parts. The heroine's encounter

scene with Bertha, the only one scene in which the invisible woman appears in front of the reader, might be a good example (XXVI, 257-59). Here both women utter no words, and Rochester the patriarch is allotted the role to differentiate them; “Compare these clear eyes with the red balls yonder. . . .” These two are objects seen through a patriarchal eye, with which the narrator conspires, describing Bertha as something lower than a human being; “it grovelled, seemingly, on all fours; it snatched and growled like some strange wild animal: . . . a quantity of dark, grizzled hair, wild as a mane, hid its head and face.” Against such a narrative, the heroine’s sympathetic voice tries to resist, “you [Rochester] are inexorable for that unfortunate lady: you speak of her with hate—with vindictive antipathy. It is cruel—she cannot help being mad” (XXVII, 265). The voice, nevertheless, is immediately suppressed by his lengthy story justifying himself. Nothing shows the narrative stance more explicitly than the fact that Bertha is completely deprived of words with the exception of the curious laughter throughout the text, although Rochester himself testifies to her ability of utterance, “she had lucid intervals of days—sometimes weeks—which she filled up with abuse of me” (XXIV, 272). The narrator, as Brontë’s advocate, whose task is to bring a story into existence, and that in patriarchal society, suppresses another story which might endanger patriarchal plot-making.

Since Adrienne Rich has read *Jane Eyre* as “a life story of a motherless woman” who seeks “the image of a nurturing or principled or spirited woman on whom she can model herself, or to whom she can look for support” (463), not a few critics try to find the image of the mother figure in some parts of the text. Yet it is my contention that *Jane Eyre* has a submerged but coherent mother/daughter plot. This essay tries to explicate how the submerged mother/daughter plot insiduously devoids the oedipal fantasy of its ideological content, and achieves to call a female Bildungsroman into existence just coextensive with a female family romance. In this essay “Jane” refers to the heroine hereafter.

II

The red-room episode with which the text opens and which covers the whole narrative of Gateshead centers around the paradoxical status of the room; although/because the room is where Mr. Reed died, the patriarch’s death chamber, it continues to be the seat of the patriarchal authority in the Reed family, attaining even a status of sanctuary: “the red-room was a spare chamber, very seldom slept in . . . : yet it was one of the largest and stateliest chambers in the mansion” (II, 10). The room represents the absence/presence of patriarchal authority in the family and the red-room episode of how young Jane’s rebellion against Master John results in her imprisonment in the room generates from the very absence/presence of patriarchal authority.

To begin with, the absence enables Jane’s emergence into this textual world as a rebel against

patriarchy ; it is Master John and Mrs. Reed who substitute the patriarchal authority in the family, but both are parodic figures of a patriarch falling short of masculinity—one is only a child and the other female, so that even so young a heroine could turn on them. Patriarchal authority, however, still holds sway on this matriarchal family ; Mrs. Reed who surrogates it punishes a rebel and imprisons her in the very site of the patriarch's death chamber and such a rebellious figure blames Mrs. Reed, citing the patriarchal authority : "What would uncle Reed say to you, if he were alive?" (IV, 23). Due to the absence/presence of patriarchal authority Jane can successfully play a father's daughter, though her words about what really dreads her to swoon in the room betrays herself : "Mr. Reed's spirit, harassed by the wrongs of his sister's child, might . . . rise before me in this chamber. . . . This idea, consolatory in theory, I felt would be terrible if realised" (II, 13). She fears that the absence might at any moment turns to the presence.

Mrs. Reed takes just the same position as Jane as to the patriarchal authority. She is herself figuratively imprisoned in the patriarch's death chamber, which takes a form of a pledge forced to take by her dying husband "to stand in the stead of a parent to a strange child she could not love" (II, 13). And yet, she has been disturbed by her husband's almost incestuous love with the child's mother and his sister : "I had a dislike to her [Jane's] mother always ; for she was . . . a great favourite with him" (XXI, 203). Her imprisoned and frustrated sexuality makes her another rebel against patriarchy, as shown in her satisfaction in taking over the Reeds by her maternal blood : "John does not at all resemble his father, and I am glad of it : John is like me and like my brothers—he is quite a Gibson" (XXXI, 204).

Mrs. Reed, Jane's reluctant pseudo-mother, has every right to be her textual mother as Jane as we know her comes into this textual world through the red-room episode. They both are rebels against patriarchy, and yet like Jane, who plays a father's daughter, she lends her hand in consolidating patriarchy, as shown in doating on her son, a patriarch to be, over all her children. She turns her anger on Jane as the late Mr. Reed's surrogate, just as Jane hates her as his surrogate ; his spirit still dominating the house separates the daughter from the mother.

The absence/presence of patriarchal authority characterizes the whole of this textual world through which Jane journeys. Just like the Reeds, the Rivers at the end of her journey have no father, and those who embody patriarchal power—Brocklehurst, Rochester and St. John—are either absent masters, as in the cases of Brocklehurst who rarely comes to the Institution living "two miles off, at a large hall" (V, 43) and Rochester who Mrs. Fairfax doesn't think "has ever been resident at Thornfield for a fortnight together" (VIII, 112), or marginalized in the case of St. John in Marsh End, who is finally expelled as far as India. Besides, Rochester, the object of Jane's desire and the textual phallus, is a little castrated from his first emergence into the text ; he is the second son, not the eldest,

of his house, and his ugliness is described even as deformity. Thus depriving the oedipal paradigm of its virility, the text opens a space into which the mother/daughter plot emerges.

III

Brocklehurst being the absent master, the presence/absence of the patriarchal authority again marks Lowood Institution. Along with the education just enough to earn her living, Jane gets the important part of the lesson through her experience of sisterhood, or a maternal pseudo-family : Miss Temple as Jane's second pseudo-mother and Helen Burns as her pseudo-sister.

Miss Temple, the superintendent of the Institution, just like Mrs. Reed, surrogates the patriarchal authority ; but she performs her duty in a way rather to mitigate the rigor of Brocklehurst and to protect the girls from his tyranny as far as she can. The scene in which Jane first comes to know her name clearly illustrates her mediative role ; she orders a lunch of bread and cheese for all girls on her own responsibility for the burnt uneatable porridge. When an infectious disease is prevalent at the Institution, she devotes herself to the role of a nurse, another aspect of the mediative role. This role, however, marks her limit. Although she does her best to protect the girls, she cannot and would not go beyond and subvert the patriarchal system.

So is Helen, who says that "it is weak and silly to say you *cannot bear* what it is your fate to be required to bear" (VI, 48). Having lost her mother, and marked by "the Latin her father had taught her" (VIII, 64), she willingly takes the role of a father's daughter. Though neglected by the earthly fathers, by Brocklehurst and by her own father, who has a new wife and shows no sign to be worried about his sick daughter, this little angel still clings to the role, till she finally goes to Heaven as a Father's daughter : "God is my father" (IX, 71). She thus plays out another aspect of a father's daughter often seen in the nineteenth century fiction—a persecuted innocent heroine like Little Nell.

Jane's claim that "I was no Helen Burns" (VII, 57) is important. When Jane notices that "Helen she [Miss Temple] held a little longer than me : she let her go more reluctantly ; it was Helen her eye followed to the door" (VIII, 64), she realizes that in this pseudo-family Miss Temple and Helen are of the same stock, to which she is only grafted. Their physical beauty also differentiates them from poor, small and plain Jane ; Miss Temple is "tall, fair, and shapely" (V, 40), and Helen, when roused within her, acquires a celestial beauty, "a beauty more singular than that of Miss Temple's" (VIII, 63). They both, who could function as authorized heroines in a patriarchal plot, have no story to tell to Jane but the stale ones—to be a nurse and survive in patriarchy or to be a little angel only to be victimized by patriarchy.

Along with the experience of the bond between women, the most important lesson Jane gets in

Lowood lies in her realization that she is different, that she is no more a father's daughter ; Helen's death is the death of herself as a father's daughter. Leaving Lowood, she is prepared to encounter a true blood mother, her "truest and darkest double" as Gilbert / Gubar call Bertha (360).

IV

All the Thornfield narrative centers around the power struggle between the sexes, between Rochester's forcible oedipal plot and Jane's attempt to resist it. Although the odds seems to be against her who has no resort but her self-respect in contrast with Rochester who has all the advantage of sex, experience and wealth, Bertha secretly lends Jane helping hand in Jane's power struggle.

Bertha activates for the first time just after the narrator confides the reader that Jane is just going to be entangled into the oedipal plot— "Gratitude, and many associations, all pleasurable and genial, made his face the object I best liked to see" (XV, 129). Bertha tries to burn him, and Jane extinguishes the fire ; he comes to admit he owes her "so immense a debt" (XV, 133). Yet the textual connotation suggests that what they do means the same, for Jane acts so as to drown him figuratively ; awakened in a pool of water, he says to her, "have you plotted to drown me?" (XV, 131). In this textual world, burning and drowning are the equivalent dooms the oedipal plot forces upon women ; both Rochester and St. John try to suttee Jane, and Bertha who actually dies in the fire, is figuratively drowned in the sea during the voyage from her native land, as Rochester advises Richard to "think of her as dead and buried" (XX, 187). Bertha and Jane cooperate in feminizing him.

Bertha's appearance into the surface narrative, however, may completely overthrow the very basis of the patriarchal plot making, so that the narrator needs to lock her up in the textual attic, just as Rochester locks her up in the Thornfield attic. In her stead, her brother, Richard Mason, functions in the surface narrative to activate the hidden mother / daughter plot. He comes twice to the Hall : first, during Rochester's courtship of Jane, and second, on the false wedding day. On each of his coming, the hidden mother / daughter plot which tries to feminize Rochester activates, relatively strengthening Jane's power.

It is not mere coincidence that just when Richard first arrives at the Hall, Rochester is away from home on false pretention, disguising himself in truth as a female gypsy. This disguise, although Rochester's ruse to draw Jane in, results in drawing her out from the surface narrative. She first does not believe in fortune telling, but when the gypsy mentions Grace Poole, who she believes at this stage laughs the curious laugh, she thinks that the gypsy is the disguised figure of Grace and begins to be wrapped "in a kind of dream" (XIX, 175). Through this quasi-communion with Bertha via Grace via

Rochester's disguised figure, she appeals to the gypsy, "mother." Through the common appellation to an old woman in lower orders, she unwittingly calls forth another "mother" to tell her fortune. Asked by Rochester "What character did I act? My own?," she makes a well chosen answer : "No ; some unaccountable one," because her real mother figure is not yet known to her.

Her return to Gateshead on the day after, and that breaking the thread of the Thornfield episode, is to clear off her relationship with the incipient mother, Mrs. Reed. She intends to reconcile with her in vain ; her visit only results in confirming Mrs. Reed's status as her m (other) She is now prepared to meet her true mother figure, that is Bertha.

On the false wedding day Richard intrudes into the textual world for the second and the last time ; this time he comes to reveal the existence of Bertha. This completely deprives Rochester of qualification to marry Jane, and thus of his authority to force the oedipal plot on her. As Rochester's legal wife, Bertha frustrates the consummation of Jane's oedipal fantasy, and for exactly the same reason, guards her from the patriarchal plot, for to marry him at this stage would provide her the same doom as Bertha's ; the threat is explicit in her word to him :

For a little while you will perhaps be as you are now,— a very little while ; and then you will turn cool ; and then you will be capricious ; and then you will be stern, and I shall have much ado to please you (XXIV, 228)

But for Bertha's existence, Jane's escape from the oedipal plot would not be justified ; it makes the choice conform to the moral code of the day.

V

Although the surface narrative effaces the significance of her meeting with Bertha on the false wedding day as the mother/daughter recognition scene, the fact is testified by the mother/daughter communion at that night.

"My daughter, flee temptation!"

"Mother, I will." (XXVII, 281)

On the submerged mother/daughter plot level, the voice that calls for the daughter is nothing but Bertha the "mother's" voice, or more realistically saying, her voice heard in Jane's psyche. This supernatural voice scene as it is often called is not so very supernatural as it seems ; it is the only one

scene in which what is hidden comes onto the surface narrative. Formerly it has been Rochester disguised as a gypsy who tells her fortune, but at this crucial moment, the “mother,” as if answering to her former appeal, appears to her and tells her the way.

The “mother” figure in this scene has been subtly but deliberately connected with Bertha throughout the text. That night Jane first dreams she lies in the red-room at Gateshead. As Gilbert/Gubar point out “the imprisoned Bertha . . . recalls . . . ten-year-old Jane, imprisoned in the red-room” (361), the red-room motif cited here prepares a space onto which the submerged plot surfaces. Next, “the light that long ago had struck me into syncope . . . seemed glidingly to mount the wall, and tremblingly to pause in the centre of the obscured ceiling,” and Jane anticipates the moon, a “symbol of the matriarchal spirit” as Rich terms it (472), to come onto this visionary space ; what young Jane has interpreted as the patriarchal spirit now turns out to be the maternal spirit. More specifically, the moon may as well remind one of the impressive description of the full and bright moon when Bertha attacks Richard. The chapter begins with the heroine’s voice :

I had forgotten to draw my curtain, which I usually did ; and also to let down my window-blind. The consequence was, that when the moon, which was full and bright . . . came in her course to that space in the sky opposite my casement, and looked in at me . . . , her glorious gaze roused me. Awaking in the dead of night, I opened my eyes on her disk—silver—white and crystal-clear. . . .

Good God! What a cry! (XX, 180-81)

When stillness returns to the Hall, “the moon declined : she is about to set” (XX, 182). In fact, it is always midnight when Bertha is active : when she tries to burn Rochester, and when she tears Jane’s wedding veil. It is the narrator’s precautions against the influence of the moon or the lunatic, so as not to overthrow the patriarchal plot completely that Jane usually carefully draws the curtain and lets down her window-blind. Nevertheless when Rochester proposes bigamous marriage to Jane and receives her innocent assent, the moon monitors her again ; it retreats behind clouds from which “a livid, vivid spark” of lightening leaps out and splits the horse chestnut. Then when Jane anticipates the coming of the moon or the maternal spirit that night — “ I watched her come — watched with the strangest anticipation ; as though some word of doom were to be written on her disk” — , it is only natural that instead of a moon came “a white human form which shone in the azure”, which recalls the shape that had appeared to Jane the previous night and torn her wedding veil ; it had worn a “white and straight” dress (XXV, 249).

Furthermore, Jane has already foreseen the white human form which shines in the azure. In her

first substantial conversation with Rochester, she shows him three drawings depicting enigmatic female figures. The second—“a woman’s shape to the bust” rising in an expanse of dark blue sky, whose “dim forehead was crowned with a star” (XIII, 110) —corresponds to this white form. Kloepfer notes that the “dark and wild eyes” and the “streaming hair” read like the description of Bertha, while the “faint lustre” reminds of the Moon Mother (40) ; but these are one in my discussion. The rest also suggest other aspects of Bertha. The drowned corpse under a swollen sea in the first recalls the woman brought over the sea only to be imprisoned and metaphorically drowned during the voyage— “a fearful voyage I had with such a monster in the vessel” (XXIV, 272) as Rochester calls it— as discussed earlier ; while the gorgeous gold bracelet suggests that the figure was once a rich exotic woman. The third drawing shows a woman’s colossal head, covered by a turban with a pale crescent which implies that the woman is not English ; and Bertha is the only one brought into this textual world from another world. Then the hopeless image below the turban— “a brow quite bloodless, white as bone, and an eye hollow and fixed, blank of meaning but for the glassiness of despair” (XIII, 110) —should be interpreted as Bertha’s, the other woman in her imprisonment. About these pictures Jane confesses, “I had imagined something which I was quite powerless to realise” (XIII, 111), and evades answering Rochester’s question, “what meaning is that in their solemn depth?”. The suppressed answer should have been thus ; in their solemn depth is the image of her “mother,” which she is too powerless to recognize and realize against the narrator’s surface narrative. Significantly, all of these images have no definite lineaments : only a fair arm is clearly visible in the first one, the lineaments of the second are “seen as through the suffusion of vapour,” and the third shows through the allusion to Milton “the shape which shape had none .”

In the mother/daughter communion scene, the figurative comes to literalization. In the surface oedipal paradigm, Bertha functions as “a satisfyingly ferocious mother avenger” (29) as Jean Wyatt interprets her. Yet just behind such a narrative framework, the duality of Jane’s “ I ”—Jane the heroine and Jane the narrator— works effectively in introducing/concealing the submerged mother/daughter plot, in which the “mother avenger” avenges not on the daughter, but on the very oedipus. The covert mother/daughter plot brought out into the surface narrative here for only the one time works to cancel the patriarchal plot.

VI

To break out of the oedipal plot, however, is a dangerous attempt, when there is no other plot to replace it with ; in resisting the oedipal fantasy, Jane runs the risk of losing the very status of the heroine. Stepping out of Thornfield, she may well think that the future is “an awful blank ; something

like the world when the deluge was gone by" (XXVII, 282).

The peril is depicted in terms of the Biblical metaphor of drowning : "the waters came into [her] soul ; I sank in deep mire ; I felt no standing ; I came into deep waters ; the flood overflowed me" (XXVI 261). This traditional metaphor for despair has more than its face value in this textual framework. For one thing, it directly connects Jane with Bertha, and connotes the peril that she might now repeat the metaphorically drowned "mother." In spite of the fact that the heroine has never seen the sea, let alone crossed it, as far as the text concerns, she has foreseen the peril repeatedly. When she first shakes hands with Rochester, for example, the emotional disturbance was described as her tossing "on a buoyant but unquiet sea" (XV, 133), and when she hears from him that he has found a new employer in Ireland for her, as he intends to marry with Miss Ingram and send Adèle to school, she thought that "colder the thought of all the brine and foam, destined, as it seemed, to rush between me and the master . . .!" (XXIII, 221). Both women are severed from him by the turbulent sea, whether metaphorically or literally. The late Mr. Rochester's butler also identifies Jane with Bertha unwittingly when he says, "for my part I have often wished that Miss Eyre had been sunk in the sea before she came to Thornfield Hall" (XXXVI, 377). In following her "mother," she is entrapped in the mother / daughter repetition : the sterile and perilous aspect of the mother / daughter plot, for in the mid-nineteenth century when there are no socially strong mothers, repeating her mother only makes a daughter a pre-social being : a madwoman or a child.

From this vicious repetition, another connotation of the drowning metaphor progresses one step further to the symbiotic mother-child union. Swollen by the turbulent sea, she is drowned in the sea of the pre-oedipal phase. In spite of her words that "the deluge was gone by," she has not gained any solid ground on which she can steadily realize another paradigm ; what fills in her blank future in the après-deluge world is the most regressed form of the mother / daughter plot. The Whitcross episode provides her baby figure, crawling on all fours (XXVII, 283). and clinging to mother Nature "with filial fondness" (XXVIII, 285), seeking her breast (XXVIII, 284). She also expresses her belief in God the Heavenly Father, but it is Rochester and not herself whom she has in mind in these words : "Sure was I of His efficiency to save what He had made (XXVIII, 285). The mother / daughter plot, however, has no such power to nurture her, that is revealed the next day, when "Want came to me [her], pale and bare" (XXVIII, 285).

Such a perilous aspect of the mother / daughter plot is explicit in the case of Bertha herself, as shown in Rochester's story : "Her mother, the Creole, was both a mad woman and a drunkard! . . . Bertha, like a dutiful child, copied her parent in both points" (XXVI, 257). Her inferior quality is thus her maternal heritage, and due to this, she is derogated so far as to be called "the clothed hyena" (XXVI, 258) by the narrator. If the mother is not so derogative, that does not make the matter so

much better. Indeed, all the inferior quality is reduced to the maternal blood in this text, as with the case of John Reed, the mother's boy, who debauchs and finally kills himself. Such a textual ideology is more conspicuous with the daughters; almost all of the daughters in this text with the exception of Helen Burns are mother's daughters as shown in their physical likenesses, from Reed sisters, the elder daughter having her mother's eye, and the younger her contour of jaw and chin (XXI, 200), and Miss Ingram, whose "face was like her mother's" (XVII, 151), up to Adèle, "a miniature of Céline Varens" (XIV, 122). But then, that is why they cannot attain the status of speech subjects; their access to language is hindered by the mother-daughter repetition.

The heroine's dreams of children reveal her subconscious anxiety of this aspect of the mother/daughter plot. The dreams appear on two separate occasions. The first series of dreams introduces the call from Gateshead, and the narrative structure forces the reader to read them in terms of Mrs. Reed, thus making their relevance to Bertha rather vague; but one sentence suggests that they appear just when she steps forward into the mother/daughter plot, parting with her pseudo-mother:

It was from companionship with this baby-phantom I had been roused on that moonlight night when I heard the cry [Richard's cry as he is attacked by Bertha]; and it was on the afternoon of the day following I was summoned downstairs by a message that some one wanted me in Mrs. Fairfax's room. (XXI, 194)

To try to tell whether Jane is a child or a mother in these dreams may be futile, for the point seems to be her subconscious anxiety of the mother/daughter plot in which she is now to join; the dreams show "a wailing child this night, and a laughing one the next" (XXI, 193). In the next two dreams which precede her false marriage, their relevance to the mother/daughter plot becomes explicit, as in waking from them she first sees Bertha (XXV, 249). These dreams, in which she cannot catch up to Rochester because she is burdened with a child, indicate that aspect of the mother/daughter plot which hinders the completion of the oedipal paradigm. Yet the latter dream—the one in which "the wall crumbled; . . . the child rolled from my knee, I lost my balance, fell" (XXV, 249)—is most important in that it foretells exactly the necessary separation of mother and daughter in the future; the dream is realized when Bertha falls down from the roof of the Hall, and thus being rolled from the mother's plot, Jane becomes free to marry Rochester. Mother should be made m(other) by the narrator, willingly or unwillingly, in order to save Jane from the sea of the pre-oedipal order.

Here is the necessity to differentiate Jane from her "mother." It is in order to assure the status of the heroine that the narrator must make her physical features quite opposite to Bertha's. While Bertha is a big corpulent woman, and "five years his [Rochester's] senior" (XXVII, 270), Jane is small, thin

and almost twenty years younger than he. To reinforce the difference, Miss Ingram is exactly Bertha's type ; just as Bertha is "the boast of Spanish Town for her beauty. . . tall, dark, and majestic" (XXVII, 268), Miss Ingram is "tall," "dark as a Spaniard" (XVII, 151), and "the very type of majesty" (XVII, 152). Besides, she forms Bertha's mirror image in her relation to Rochester ; young Rochester makes a mercenary marriage with Bertha who wanted him because he was "of a good race" (XXVII, 268), and now Miss Ingram of a titled family would marry him for money. The meaning of the marriage which Rochester and Miss Ingram act out in the charade hints more than they mean. The second scene suggests that the bride in the first is found by the patriarchal order, which parallels Rochester's explanation that his father and elder brother "plot [ted] against me" (XXVII, 269) to arrange his marriage. The third turns the bride into the bridewell in which he is imprisoned (XVIII, 161-62), as is the true bride, as we know. Miss Ingram, enacting the role of Bertha, apparently represents Bertha's seeming alter ego.

The most remarkable differentiating feature, however, is the racial difference. Although the fact remains that the narrator exploits the racial ideology of the day, Bertha is not imported into this textual world to consolidate the subject (Azim) ; rather, to consolidate the subject, she should be expelled from this textual world. Though Rochester could have married an uprising capitalist's daughter of the day if only for mercenary marriage, the textual politics necessitates that she be a Creole. Azim points out that "feminist discourse, informed by colonial history, has, in its concentration on *Jane Eyre* as an imperialist text, overlooked the difficulties in being Jane Eyre" (196-97).

The fissure in Jane's dual " I " has generated such diverse feminist interpretations of Bertha. When Gilbert / Gubar read the madwoman as Jane's psychic double, they are referring to Jane as a heroine, while in Spivak's interpretation the subject in question seems to be the narrator as a subject at the expense of the native self-consolidating Other. It is because she is Jane's psychic double, or her "mother," that she should be differentiated as Other in this textual framework to build the heroine's speech subject. The crucial problem for nineteenth century heroines was to find the buried mother ; and for nineteenth century female authors to find the buried mother and at the same time to bury her.

VI

It is only natural that the narrator gives Jane at her last moment wet and cold, again metaphorically drowning, the Rivers family as her saviours. Starting from the matrilineal Reed family, unreliable as the name shows, Jane finally seems to find her identity in patrilineal blood, the Rivers, the name of which may metaphorically refers to the running of blood. Here, the oedipal paradigm inherent in the male Bildungsroman is seemingly completed ; a subject separating from

m (other) is allowed into the symbolic order when it identifies itself in the Name-of-the-Father. At the same time, this patriarchal paradigm is covertly revised. How she is saved by the Rivers is subtle. Finding the mother Nature to be m (other), it is again in a maternal home that she asks for help ; in the house she sees two young women and an old servant through the window, where she hears significantly that they had recently lost a patriarch. Although the fatherless family does not allow her in until St. John, a new patriarch, returns—this contrasts remarkably with the cases of Lowood and Thornfield, where she is received by women during the absence of patriarchs—Jane is not altogether caught in the paternal paradigm.

It is important that the Rivers family is never the Eyre family, and the family changes from the patrilineal to the matrilineal when viewed otherwise ; the family is patrilineal from Jane's side, but she is a matrilineal cousin of the family. Beneath its patrilineal appearance lurks a covert maternal family as shown in Hannah's words, "th' Rivers' wor gentry i' thi' owd days o' th' Henrys," still, "the 'bairns' had taken after her [their mother]" (XXIX, 301-2). Their resemblance to their mother, like the other daughters in the text, is no more the mark of their inferiority, but of their relatedness to Jane. Furthermore, by her using an alias, Jane Elliott, leaving her first name unchanged, her name of the father is completely cancelled in Marsh End. Her final pseudo-family formed here is her hiding place from the patriarchal plot, as St. John says, "every research after her course had been vain : the country had been scoured far and wide" (XXXIII, 335).

In this ambiguous family, all her problems are solved ; she becomes an heiress and an independent woman, and during which Rochester's legal wife dies behind the text. But then, why does so important a figure as Mr. Eyre who bequeathed her remain shadowy?

Mr. Eyre is first mentioned at Gateshead as another choice for the young heroine ; she at this point chose to go to school rather than to "some poor, low relations called Eyre" (III, 20). Next she hears about him just on leaving Lowood for Thornfield ; Bessie comes to see her and drops the news that he came to Gateshead to see Jane before leaving England (X, 80). The third time Mrs. Reed on her death-bed confesses to her that she had hidden his letter for Jane, a letter which tells that he has succeeded in Madeira and would adopt her and bequeath her all his property (XXI, 209). When the way is cleared for Jane to meet her "mother" by the death of Mrs. Reed, she is informed of his offer. His intention behind the text is gradually revealed corresponding with each step of her mother quest as another possible choice whether she is aware of it or not. The fourth time she hears of him is just after her encounter with Bertha ; Briggs, his solicitor, tells her that he is dying, which means that she will be an heiress in the near future. The mother/daughter recognition puts his fortune within Jane's reach. The text enables Jane's progress toward independence through such textual mechanics that just as the mother/daughter plot advances, the daughter comes near to the fortune from Mr. Eyre ; he conspires

with the mother/daughter plot.

It is not surprising that the invisible man is inherently related to the invisible woman. Behind the text Mr. Eyre in Madeira is conveniently acquainted with the Masons in the West Indies, but his connection with Bertha goes beyond the fact that he is acquainted with her family. Informed of the contemplated union between Jane and Rochester by her letter, written with the intention that if she might be an independent woman through his fortune, Mr. Eyre sends Richard to prevent the false marriage. Richard who activates the mother/daughter plot as Bertha's surrogate works also as Mr. Eyre's surrogate. The two who have Richard as their substitute work for the same end ; he works just as Bertha the "mother" would like to do if she were socially strong. Indeed, his offer to adopt her, to make her an adopted daughter of a rich wine merchant in Madeira, would have made her just another Bertha.

We cannot say that Mr. Eyre *is* Bertha, because he is not. Yet in the sense that he functions just as she does, we can say that he is her double ; John Eyre, the male name for Jane Eyre, is a concocted hollow figure for Bertha in the mid-nineteenth century when it is impossible to make such a plot as mother/daughter bequeathment. It is in August that Mr. Eyre dies (XXXIII, 338) and "just about harvest time" that year Bertha dies (XXXVI, 375). It is no wonder that in spite of Diana's words, "My father always cherished the idea that he [Mr. Eyre] would atone for his error by leaving his possessions to us" (XXX, 315), all the fortune is bequeathed to Jane. It is important that just when she finds she has become an heiress she is informed that Rochester is no more at Thornfield. While Jane becomes independent, just behind the text, Rochester's patriarchal power is weakened. Maimed Rochester is castrated Rochester as Gilbert/Gubar points out, but the castration is performed by Bertha. As Azim notes that "colonial possessions and wealth, Creolize, as it were, the central figure" (177), when Jane inherits his legacy, she becomes a true daughter of Bertha. Beneath the surface narrative could be traced the hidden narrative of the mother/daughter plot that the daughter by her mother's legacy becomes an independent woman.

Some critics point out that what would the heroine do if returning to Rochester not knowing Bertha's death, she finds her alive. Yet from the mechanics of the text, when the surface narrative is describing how the heroine becomes an heiress, Bertha should have been dead, destroying Rochester's patriarchal power.

Although Jane finds her identity in seemingly patrilineal blood, the text never gives her father's name. While her mother's name is revealed in the text as "Miss Jane Reed" (XXXIII, 338), her father is mentioned only as "a poor curate" (XXXIII, 334). In this female Bildungsroman the Name-of-the-Father remains void.

IX

In Marsh End where the maternal is fused and conforms to the patriarchal paradigm, the text makes Jane go over all the previous steps—Gateshead, Lowood, and Thornfield—as if to mediate her previous rebellious figure. Helen Moglen points out that both in the Reeds and the Rivers (and also in the Ingrams), there are two daughters and a son but no father (135). Indeed, the Rivers which also begins with R, is a sacred version of the Reeds as implied in the names ; St. John instead of John Reed, and goddesses Christian or pagan—Mary and Diana—instead of secular Eliza and Georgiana. At the same time, it is another Lowood Institution formed of a rigid patriarch and a kind of sorority. St. John quite reminds one of Brocklehurst, who seemed just like “a black pillar” (IV, 26) to young Jane :

he was of the material from which nature hews her heroes . . . her lawgivers, her statesmen, her conquerors ; . . . at the fireside, too often a cold cumbrous column, gloomy and out of place.
(XXXIV, 346)

The only difference is that one is a saint while the other only pretends to be. Furthermore, Marsh End becomes another Thornfield when St. John offers Jane just the opposite choice offered by Rochester—loveless marriage instead of a life of love without marriage ; the affinity of so apparently different characters is also seen in the fact that while Rochester went to the West Indies by his father’s plot, St. John would go to India summoned by the Father’s Plot. Both of them, the followers of the patriarchal plot, would take her out of England when married, which means suttee to her ; she says to Rochester that she will “not be hurried away in a suttee” (XXV, 240) and to marry St. John means to be “grilled alive in Calcutta” in Diana’s words (XXXV, 366). Here again at her crucial moment, the supernatural voice , this time Rochester’s, shows her the way.

This time the voice cannot be reduced to a solely maternal one. “The room was full of moonlight” (XXXV, 369) as before, when she heard the mysterious summons, “Jane! Jane! Jane!” Running out into the garden to look for the voice, she reduces it to the working of the maternal principle : “it is the work of nature. She was roused, and did—no miracle—but her best.” At the same time it is the answer to her entreaty to Heaven, the paternal principle, “Show me, show me the path!”. Thus the narrative framework makes the “voice of a human being” (XXXV, 369-70) a summons from Heaven, the ultimate Father, and justifies the return to Thornfield. This time, to leave Marsh End does not mean to go out of the oedipal paradigm ; rather, it means to reinscribe herself into the paradigm as an independent woman.

In the concluding chapter Jane occupies her seat in patriarchy, marrying Rochester and bearing

him a son who “inherited his own eyes” (XXXVIII, 397). Yet the place where they live happily, Farndean, is an unhealthy place in the heart of a forest with “those damp walls,” even unsuitable in which to hide the madwoman (XXVII, 264). Though this story is concluded with marriage, the conventional happy ending, it is the marriage which could only be formed in the woods. Just as the ideological center of the patriarchal plot, the Name-of-the-Father, remains void, the ideological center of this text becomes void.

This textual void calls forth St. John’s letter from India, which places Farndean relatively central. Furthermore, the importance of the letter lies in that it ends, and consequently the text ends, with the prayer for Jesus, and thus compensates the ideological void. Young Jane, asked what must she do to avoid going to hell, answers that “I must keep in good health and not die”; she here tries to evade the plot of the Father, if not quite denies it. Yet here the narrator comments that “my answer when it did come was objectionable” (IV, 27). Jane’s rebellion against patriarchy has been thus mediated through the narrator’s technique to conform patriarchal plot throughout the text, and the final textual gesture to fill in the void Name-of-the-Father is the prayer for the Father’s plot, “Amen ; even so come, Lord Jesus!”

In the world where the Name-of-the-Mother is delegitimated and effaced, mother quest is made only to bury the mother, although it is due to the mother that the father’s plot is secretly subverted. The narrow success of this female Bildungsroman is due to the void Name-of-the-Father.

Works Cited

- Azim, Firdous. *The Colonial Rise of the Novel*. London : Routledge, 1993.
- Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. New York & London : Norton, 1987.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic : The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-century Literary Imagination*. New Haven : Yale UP, 1977.
- Kloepfer, Deborah Kelly. *The Unspeakable Mother : Forbidden Discourse in Jean Rhys and H. D.* Ithaca and London : Cornell UP, 1989.
- Moglen, Helen. *Charlotte Brontë : The Self Conceived*. Wisconsin : U. of Wisconsin P., 1984.
- Rich, Adrienne. “Jane Eyre : The Temptation of a Motherless Woman.” *Jane Eyre*. New York & London : Norton, 1987.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Three Women’s Texts and a Critique of Imperialism,” *Critical Inquiry*. Autumn 1985.
- Tillotson, Kathleen. *Novels of the Eighteen-Forties*. London : Oxford UP, 1954.
- Wyatt, Jean. *Reconstructing Desire : The Role of Unconscious in Women’s Reading and Writing*. Chapel Hill and London : U. of North Carolina P., 1990.