

UNIVERZITA PARDUBICE
FAKULTA FILOZOFICKÁ

**TWO FACES OF NATURALISM: THOMAS
HARDY'S *JUDE THE OBCURE* AND ÉMILE
ZOLA'S *GERMINAL***

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE

2008

Radka MIKYSKOVÁ

**University of Pardubice
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy**

**Two faces of Naturalism: Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* and Émile
Zola's *Germinal***

Radka Mikysková

**Thesis
2008**

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky
Akademický rok: 2006/2007

ZADÁNÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE (PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení: **Radka MIKYSKOVÁ**
Studijní program: **M7503 Učitelství pro základní školy**
Studijní obor: **Učitelství anglického jazyka**

Název tématu: **Comparing the features of Naturalism in *Germinal* and *Jude the Obscure***

Zásady pro vypracování:

Studentka se nejprve ve své diplomové práci zaměří na charakteristiku naturalismu jako literárního směru, zařadí jej do soudčeho kulturního kontextu a osvětlí zdroje na jejichž základě naturalismus vznikl. Dále se bude věnovat srovnání charakteristických rysů francouzského a anglického naturalismu na základě vybraných reprezentativních děl, tj. *Germinal* ze série *Rougon-Macquart* Emila Zoly a *Jude the Obscure* Thomase Hardyho. Rozhory obou děl dají základ pro nalezení odlišností či podobných rysů obou naturalistických škol, případně odhalí jejich vzájemné ovlivňování. Kulturní analýzu založenou na výskumu sekundárních zdrojů doplní textové analýzy primární literatury.

Rozsah grafických prací:

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Forma zpracování diplomové práce: tištěná/elektronická

Seznam odborné literatury:

ZOLA, Émile. *Germinial*. London: David Campbell Publishers, 1991. ISBN 1-85715-024-1

HARDY, Thomas. *Jude the Obscure*. London: Penguin Books Ltd. 1994.

DRABBLE, M. *The Oxford Companion to the English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. ISBN 0-19-861453-5 978-0-19-861453-1

STŘÍBRNÝ, Zdeněk. *Dějiny anglické literatury, II.díl*. Praha: Academia, 1987.

CRAIG, IL (ed.) *dějiny anglické literatury* Praha: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury a umění, 1963.

SANDERS, A. *The Short Oxford history of English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. ISBN 0-19-926338-8

KUNTZ, S., HAYCRAFT, H. (eds.) *British authors of the nineteenth century*. New York: The H.W.Wilson, 1960.

HESELTINE, J.E., HARVEY, P. (eds.) *Oxford Companion to French literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.

FISHER, J.O. a kol. *Dějiny francouzské literatury*. Praha: Academia, 1983.

FRYČEK, J., DOLEŽALOVÁ, P. *Slovník francouzsky píšících spisovatelů*. Praha: Libri, 2002. ISBN 80-7277-130-2

Vedoucí diplomové práce:

Mgr. Olga Ročnická

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání diplomové práce:

30. dubna 2007

Termín odevzdání diplomové práce:

31. března 2008

prof. PhDr. Petr Vacek, OSa

děkan

L.S.

PaedDr. Eva Černá, Ph.D.

vedoucí katedry

V Praze, v letech dne 30. listopadu 2007

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank Mgr. Olga Roebuck, M.Litt. Ph.D. for her supervision.

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is firstly to characterize the era when Naturalism appeared with focus on cultural and historic context. Therefore significant philosophical movements and scientific knowledge will be described in order to explain the general framework in which Naturalism emerged and which were its shaping factors. Secondly the analysis of primary sources is carried out, works of Hardy and Zola, two significant Naturalist writers, will be used. Specific issues significant for this literary movement such as genetic determination, Darwin's *Theory*, psychological analysis of characters and influence of environment and circumstances will be discussed separately with focus on each of the two writers. This thesis will explain the possible influences of two naturalistic approaches, their similarities and differences.

Key words

Naturalism, Émile Zola, Thomas Hardy, genetic determination, psychological analysis, circumstances and environment, Social Darwinism

Souhrn

Cílem této diplomové práce je nejprve charakterizovat období, ve kterém naturalismus vznikl se zaměřením na kulturní a historický vývoj a kontext. Za účelem osvětlení všeobecného rámce vzniku naturalismu budou popsány významné filosofické směry a vědecké poznatky, které působily jako jeho formující faktory. Dále bude provedena analýza primárních zdrojů, tedy prací Hardyho a Zoly, dvou významných naturalistických spisovatelů tohoto literárního směru. Charakteristické oblasti významné pro tento literární směr, jako je genetická determinace, Darwinova *Teorie*, psychoanalýza hlavních postav a vliv prostředí a okolností, budou rozebrány zvlášť s důrazem na jednotlivé spisovatele. Tato diplomová práce vysvětlí možné vzájemné vlivy obou naturalistických přístupů, jejich shodné a odlišné znaky.

Klíčová slova

Naturalismus, Émile Zola, Thomas Hardy, genetická determinace, psychologická analýza, okolnosti a prostředí, sociální darwinismus.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Introduction..... | 1 |
| 2. Historic context and the birth of Naturalism..... | 2 |
| 2.1. The first occurrence of naturalistic features in French literature..... | 4 |
| 2.2. Naturalism around the world..... | 5 |
| 3. Sources of Naturalism..... | 7 |
| 4. Characteristic of Naturalism..... | 10 |
| 4.1 Naturalism and its form, subject matter and characters..... | 13 |
| 5. A comparison of important issues in <i>Jude the Obscure</i> and <i>Germinal</i>..... | 14 |
| 5.1. Psychological analysis of novels' main characters..... | 15 |
| 5.1.1. Conclusion..... | 21 |
| 5.2. Impact of sciences, analytic approach..... | 22 |
| 5.2.1. Genetic determination..... | 23 |
| 5.2.2. Darwinism, humans perceived as animals' descendants..... | 28 |
| 5.2.3. Objectivity..... | 32 |
| 5.2.4. Conclusion..... | 34 |
| 5.3. Sex and love - deep rooted passions..... | 36 |
| 5.4. Social environment, Taine's "le moment et la millieu"..... | 45 |
| 6. Conclusion..... | 55 |
| 7. Résumé..... | 58 |
| 8. Bibliography..... | 62 |

1. Introduction

The nineteenth century witnessed many various literary movements, changing quickly especially in the last decades of the century. Realism, a predecessor of Naturalism, gave a base for depicting reality objectively and sincerely. Scientific innovations and changes in social conditions supported writers' interest in new topics and they started to choose their characters among ordinary or lower class people. New philosophical and medical knowledge inspired a group of writers to apply these in novel and drama writing.

Not only Émile Zola and Thomas Hardy were influenced by Positivism, philosophy of Taine and Darwin's Theory or Doctor Bernard's method. But Zola and Hardy connected this knowledge with influence of environment and circumstances or conditions people live in order to show their influence of people's lives and problems the conventions society kept can cause.

This thesis aim is to compare Zola's and Hardy's approaches to Naturalism, in which extent they applied the significant features of this style. The significant features are brought in this thesis by analysis of secondary sources devoted to literary theory. According to the analysis various characteristic of this literary movement are examined on primary sources from both authors. Émile Zola's *Germinal* and Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* were chosen, being the masterpieces of their authors, exceeding the frame of Naturalism and functioning as great witnesses of the end of the nineteenth century. Both Zola and Hardy tried to depict the reality with objectivity. This thesis tries to assess their success in this area as well as in other important premises of Naturalism. Genetic determination, objectivity, social environment and psychological analysis of novels' characters are objects of this thesis research. The influence the authors could provide to each other is another object of this thesis aims.

Naturalism developed into a significant literary movement, being partially a product of progress in science and philosophy. Thus it is considered an interesting field of study of many literary critics and it is not forgotten in current literary criticism.

2. Historic context and the birth of Naturalism

Naturalism was born in the nineteenth century, an important time period for Europe's future development, both cultural and political. From the historic point of view, the nineteenth century could be characterized by nationalism. The borders of Europe changed and many new states were established. The unification of Italy in 1861 and Germany in 1871 led to the weakening of traditional powers such as the Habsburg Empire and France. On the other hand, new leaders appeared. Germany and a unified Italy became important players in the field of international affairs.

France itself played one of the most significant roles in Europe's future political development. The Great Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars led to the great instability of the French empire and later on several revolutionary waves took place in France during years 1830 – 1848. The most significant loss was an occupation of France's industrial territory, Alsace-Lorraine, by Germany in 1870.

But the most influential changes took place in society itself. Positivism and the philosophy of Hippolyte Taine were crucial for intellectual movements at that time, as was Charles Darwin's *Theory of Species*. These philosophical and scientific influences will be discussed separately in the next chapter. Even though these philosophical and scientific movements were very influential from the educated people's point of view, the Industrial Revolution will be described as one of the most influential factors for nineteenth century society.

The rapid development of industry, such as textiles, traffic and many important inventions brought innovations into the life of mankind but on the other hand they affected people's lives negatively as well. More and more people coming to towns to search for work meant rapid development of these towns but social conditions for living were not getting better fast enough. In the nineteenth century a lot of workers' strikes took place around Europe, calling for improvement of working conditions in factories, mostly for shortening, or even restriction in the case of children, of working hours. France and Great Britain were not exceptions. The exploitation of workers, bad living and working conditions and the struggle between the wealthy newly born capitalists and the paupers became new interesting topics for writers. Authors throughout the world were inspired by these topics and motifs, for example Zola's *Germinal*, Hauptmann's

Die Weber or Theodore Dreisser's *The Financier* can be listed. The scope of writers' topics was enriched with new characters from lower class people contrasting with stories about a new, wealthy bourgeoisie class. This interesting social environment, which had not been described till this decade, became the basis of the most famous novels from these times. New topics and motifs connected to newly emerged social situation are the features which proved the connection between Naturalism and the Industrial Revolution. All these events affected public life, and became a driving force for cultural development providing various motives for artists and intellectual movements.

To classify Naturalism from a temporal point of view, it developed in France in the last third of the nineteenth century. The literary form of Naturalism develops from its literary predecessor, Realism. Both styles concentrate on detailed descriptions of conditions of living, descriptions of places and people's characters. But realism did not represent everything and the true novel-writing stands elsewhere for some authors of the nineteenth century. As Henriette Psichari adds, readers were disturbed and bored at the same time by the imaginative novels full of villagers or comic operas. It was necessary that the novels were true and from real life. (Psichari, 7)

L. Deffoux compares Realism and Naturalism to the last years of the eighteenth century France: Realism represents The Revolution of 1789 and Naturalism stands for The Reign of Terror in 1793. (Furst, L.R., Skrine, P.N., 8) The author of this quote probably meant the difference between the approach of Realists and Naturalists to reality as they depicted it in their works. Realism first attacked the real world and writers described it with objectivity but it was not enough for Naturalists. They added more shocking subjects, rude vocabulary and descriptions of every possible detail they could write about.

Because of its origins in Realism, Naturalism can be characterized by its intensification. But while all the new features added into novel writing led to specification of topics and literary means, on the other hand it resulted in narrowing and naturalism became more limited as well. Therefore according to some literary critics it could be considered as a lesser literary movement in comparison with Realism.

Naturalists believed that art should be a representation of reality of the outer world and that it should not be based on imagination or on a subjective point of view of

a writer or another artist, which is what Romantics are criticised for by Naturalists. These attitudes resulted in Naturalists' delight in subjects of ordinary life, situations which were close-to-hand and they also focused on the impersonal and scientific approach of the artist. (Furst, L.R., Skrine, P.N., 8)

According to Harvey and Heseltine the new mimetic elements in naturalistic writing were based on natural sciences and philosophy. These are the crucial elements which distinguish Realism and Naturalism. According to Emile Zola, the development of literary styles from realism to naturalism started at Diderot and writers as Stendhal, Balzac and Flaubert. The last innovators were the Goncourt brothers. On the other hand, there was no "naturalistic school" in France according to Zola. (Harvey, Heseltine: 1959)

2.1. The first occurrence of naturalistic features in French literature

The first writers who brought naturalistic features into their works were the Goncourt brothers. Edmond and Jules de Goncourt laid foundations of a new literary style, Naturalism. They were on friendly terms with Gustave Flaubert, Alphonse Daudet and Émile Zola, of course. They often wrote together and most of their famous works are products of their co-operation. Not only novels but drama was also a part of their literary work. In their biography we can find several important dates connected to the public life, but the year 1865 is crucial for the brothers and for naturalism as well. *Germinie Lacerteux* was published as the first literary work with naturalistic features. Its introduction contains a manifesto of naturalism. (Adamy)

In their introduction, the authors call the book a true novel coming from streets and a tragedy which seeks to find out whether the story of lower social class may move the upper classes to tears. Their confidence in readers as an audience expecting cheering and comforting happy end lead the Goncourt brothers to write a provoking story, a clinical study of love. The purpose is not to shock the audience but to provoke its habits and describe the sorrows which should not be forgotten. The introduction specifies the methods of writing a novel as well. The novel must be a kind of social investigation which will force the readers to remember the suffering of their contemporaries. The novel then becomes moral history and methods and duties of science must be applied. (Goncourt, E., Goncourt, 7-8)

As Zatloukal describes the beginnings of French Naturalism, among the most famous novels of the Goncourt brothers, *Manette Salomon* (1867) or *Madame Gervaisais* (1869) can be counted. Their women characters or people who were close to them were affected by great suffering. This misfortune was caused by the heredity of neurosis. In their works, Goncourt brothers studied moral, psychological and physical fall and it particularly focuses on the psychological state of mind of characters who are often mentally disturbed. Long descriptions of these psychological aspects of their characters are combined with technical terms and comments. The facts presented by writers were based on observations of real people in a real world, but they were focused on special examples and mostly bizarre motives. (Fisher, 53 – 58)

Zatloukal further summarizes the significance of naturalistic literary movement. Later on, when Zola had already published his first naturalistic novels, several young authors proclaimed him their teacher and founder of Naturalism. In 1877 Zola bought a house near Paris where a group of writers met every Thursday in order to debate literary questions. They called themselves *The Group de Médan* and wanted to draw critics' attention to naturalism and stand as its manifesto. Young members of this group, Joris-Karl Huysmans, Henry Céard, Léon Hennique, Paul Alexis and Guy de Maupassant applied Zola's principles in their first novels. A collection of stories documenting the Prussian-French War, *Les Soirées de Médan* (1880), was the first literary product of this group. But for Naturalism itself, the group was not of a great importance. Apart from Zola, Huysmans and Maupassant, none of the other writers became significant in world or even French literary history. On the top of that, they were given a derisory nickname by a journalist: 'Zola's Tail'. This may indicate that the development of Naturalism was dependent mostly on Zola and hardly anybody provided new ideas or concepts apart from the founder himself in France. (Fisher, 79- 81)

2.2. Naturalism around the world

Naturalism spread around Europe and over the sea and developed differently in each country. This chapter will deal with literary groups applying naturalistic approach in other European or overseas countries. Although the main concepts and scientific approach stayed the same, national specifics influenced each group and led to diversity

in style and literary means. Because of this thesis' focus, the first group that will be investigated is the English group, naturalistic groups from The United States and Germany will follow in order to draw a contextual line between these movements.

English literature of the last two centuries was dominated by Realism. Starting with Jane Austen and continuing through Charles Dickens, W. M. Thackeray, George Elliot or Charles Dickens, its characteristic features established in writers writing habits and the literary tradition was deeply influenced by this style. According Furst and Skrine, this was the reason for a weak occurrence of Naturalism in English literature. Furst and Skrine further stated that because the realistic tradition had already brought many changes in literary means into English novel writing, Naturalism did not represent such a revolutionary change as it did on the Continent. (Furst, Skrine, 32) On the other hand, Darwin's *Theory of Species* was rather popular in Great Britain and Herbert Spencer developed it further on and applied it on the relations of a society. Comte's *Positivism* was studied by John Stuart Mill and few writers applied some of the scientific, especially sociologic, discoveries in their novels. Although several novels influenced by Naturalism appeared at the end of the nineteenth century, Naturalism did not establish itself as a significant literary movement and no special group of writers was formed. The scientific approach as such was not used by English writers, who stayed confident to their own style. That means Realism spiced with some features of Naturalism, which gave their work new specific taste. Among these authors George Elliot or Thomas Hardy are counted by many encyclopedias.

According to Furst and Skrine, in the United States, Naturalism developed into a significant literary movement with a long duration. The works of Dreisser, Crane or Steinbeck (*The Grapes of Wrath* published in 1939) depict harsh reality of the nineteenth and even the twentieth century United States. The Industrial Revolution was an important topic here as well, showing the struggle between the poor and the capitalists, economic problems and corruption or machination in political and public life of the United States serving as a main story line for many of the Naturalistic novels. In terms of the established concept known from Europe, America's Naturalism was not so theory and method bounded as the one in France. Although all the new scientific and philosophic movements and inventions were broadly known among the educated

society in the United States, determinism as such influenced the style of writing of American writers very slowly and just partially. (Furst, Skrine, 35 – 40)

While American Naturalism was relatively free, not so well defined and actually unorganized into any movement, German writers formed several groups and wrote their manifestoes and formulated their artistic intentions. Furst and Skrine described two main groups were represented by Michael G. Conrad, Arno Holz and Gerhart Hauptman. In spite of its firm organization, the concept of science was applied more weakly in Germany than in France. It gave authors certain freedom for imagination even though authors such as Holz neglected it strongly. Not only novel writing, but also drama played an important part in German Naturalism as well. Even poetry was attempted. But it did not prove to be successful, Naturalism only glittered from these poems from the scientific point of view. (Furst, Skrine, 41 – 47)

3. Sources of Naturalism

Naturalistic authors inspired themselves in the works of several important philosophers and scientists. Positivism and the philosophy of Hippolyte Taine can be counted among the main philosophical sources. Deterministic theory of Dr. Prosper Lucas and the theory of evolution of Charles Darwin are the main sources from the scientific point of view.

The theory of evolution called *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* and published by Sir Charles Darwin in 1859 caused serious arguments and disagreements in the world of science. It served as a detonator and brought a new interesting topic into the never-ending debates which were held among the scientists, middle class people and the aristocracy as well. Therefore it could be considered as one of the most influential changes of the nineteenth century, full of breaking inventions and new philosophic ideas or movements.

As Furst and Skrine claim, this scandal, as the *Theory* was scandalous for many people of nineteenth century, helped the *Theory* to broader publicity. Translated into German in 1860 and French in 1862, it became known all over the most populated countries of Europe. In the Victorian Era, where people were believed to be of Divine

Will, Darwin could not have expected any better response from people and the Church than he got back. His thoughts were provoking and shocking and the premise, that the stronger one goes far while the weaker one stays back or dies, was incompatible with all the religious teaching and Victorian morality. The effect was that even though most people and many scientists disagreed with it, the Theory served as a basis for Émile Zola, who took its most important premise of a man being developed from animal and his behavior according to his deepest instincts and passions being natural for him. This resulted in descriptions of man's life as a continuous struggle between heredity, circumstances and environment of a moment and from naturalistic point of view people are not far from animals, which did not give them a chance for better life. (Furst, Skrine, 15-16)

Positivistic philosophy was formulated by the French philosopher Auguste Comte in the first half of the nineteenth century and later on served as another source for Naturalists. Comte criticized metaphysics for its ungrounded speculations and labeled it as "a relic of theological and mythological period of mankind development." (Audi, 147) According to his thoughts the main aim of science is a classification and systematization of cognition based on the method of observation based on sensory perception. Science is therefore restricted only to the observable but when systematized and organized it enables predictable situations and phenomena not only in science itself but in society as well. (Horyna, 323) Comte dealt with social organization and was convinced that any society passes through three intellectual stages: 1. interpreting phenomena theologically, 2. metaphysically, 3. positivistically. The positivistic stage is the final one with respect to science and its methods. Finally Comte formulated a statement claiming that a society develops according to the laws of nature. (Audi, 147)

To summarize, in the words of Furst and Skrine, positivism can be viewed more as an approach rather than a completely new philosophical doctrine. It is significant for the nineteenth century in terms of its methodology which brought inevitable changes into the study of religion and further on in the birth of a new scientific discipline, sociology. (Furst, Skrine, 19)

Hippolyte Taine (1828-1893) was according to various sources one of the most productive philosophers of the nineteenth century. His ideas and views on contemporary culture and art history formed opinions of many of his contemporaries. Briefly

summarized, Taine follows the ideas of Hegel or Comte and established enlightenment of empiric facts and their placement in super-ordinate context and came to the scientific method as a feasible way of research means. (Fisher, 30 - 36)

According to Furst and Skrine, he also accepted Darwin's Theory of Evolution and in his *Essais de critique et d'histoire (1866)* he defended the idea of a man as a follower of lower animals and later apes with a strong focus on heredity claiming that "the primary molecule is inherited, and its acquired shape is passed on partially and gradually by heredity." (Furst, Skrine, 8)

Race (race, nation, disposition), environment (cultural and social) and moment (voice of the time, context of contemporary situation and literary works) are crucial elements responsible for producing a human and art work as well. This confirms Taine's focus on scientific and deterministic theory. It helped him to derive a similar theory for literary works. It claims that every art work can be explained only in its environment. His theories defended realism and influenced Zola's view on literature.

Not only The philosophy of Taine was scientific source of Naturalism. *Introduction a l'etude de la medecin experimental*, (Introduction to the Scientific Study of Medecine) written by doctor Claude Bernard and published first in 1865. Conti calls Dr. Bernard one of the fathers of experimental physiology being an important part of extraordinary scientific progress that took place in the second half of the nineteenth century. Together with Louis Pasteur, Dr. Bernard is the most celebrated scientist in France. His discoveries influenced modern physiology and became well known in all Europe, Bernard's fame even exceeded the borders of scientific world. In his methodological concept *Introduction a l'etude de la medecin experimental* Bernard succeeded in establishing and ordering methods for experimentation and theoretical analysis in the life sciences. (Conti, 1- 6)

The experimental conception of medicine made Zola realize that the method Bernard suggested for medicine is convenient for art, especially novel writing as well. The scientific methods infiltrated into the literature, the word 'writer' could have been substituted easily with the term 'scientist', according to Zola, because both the writer and the scientist can experiment with his material. Conti further claims, that Zola based Naturalistic novel writing on Dr. Bernard's knowledge and using his terms, such as experiment, determinism, milieu, hypothesis, doubt, and claimed that the way

the naturalist novelist should work on the laws governing human behaviour should be the same as the method applied by a scientist in his explanation of the laws of the physical world. (Conti, 3) In *Le Roman expérimental* Zola defended and explained the significance of observation and analysis in literature.

Many different opinions evaluating and even criticizing the role and use of science in literature have appeared so far. But however they differ or speculate about the role of science, they all of them have in common that without all the suddenly emerged movements and approaches Naturalism could not be shaped and its doctrines formulated. But not only criticism appears on account of Naturalism. Lehmann vindicates Naturalism as a linkage between “historical process of modernism rather than being limited by the heredity and/or environment of the novel.” (Ratner, 1)

4. Characteristics of Naturalism

The following paragraphs will describe typical features of naturalistic writing and the ideas already presented and outlined in previous chapters will be discussed in detail. Two crucial novels of elementary importance for naturalism will be analyzed from viewpoint of the significance for its development.

Le roman expérimental (1880), a work where Zola summarized all the theory of writing a naturalistic novel, aspects and features of naturalism, gave a clear picture of this style and stands as its manifesto. Not only Dr. Bernard's work and the philosophy of Taine's were important for Zola, he worked also with the Theory of Heredity created by Prosper Lucas. Fryčera states that Zola shows a hereditary burden of family members. In his concept of Naturalism, Zola changed a man to a biological object and the purpose of this change was to reveal the changes in human organism which are elicited in such an organism under the pressure of physiological processes. (Fryčera, 733)

The preface to the second edition of Zola's novel *Thérèse Raquin* (1867) contains Zola's explanation of his methods and concepts but the main aim of this explanation is a defend of Zola's first naturalistic novel, which was according to him deeply misunderstood by critics. Furst and Skrine states that the critics were shocked by

the immorality and perversion of this novel. Some of them even called it a piece of pornography and talked about mud, puddle and a sickness which overtook them while reading this novel. Zola justifies his thoughts and ideas and expresses his disappointment about critics' incapability of reading with understanding and broader perspective. According to him the critics did not understand the scientific approach and were not able to accept the writer as a scientist whose aim is to make an objective analysis and an interesting physiological study. Zola did not feel immoral because of writing about lower class people and their passions even though the critics strongly opposed his choice of characters and methods. He claimed that the scientific aim of the novel, to describe analytically the state of the characters, gave the novel the objectivity which exceeds the criteria of morality. According to him, the novelist, or in other word the scientist, should be perceived as "neutral analyst of observed facts". (Furst, Skrine, 29)

The characters should have been described as temperaments with all their passions and basic instincts controlling their behaviour and actions. These temperaments do not behave according to their free will, which is suppressed by those passions and instincts, or as Zola himself put it, 'by their nerves and blood.' [Zola, 1966: 24] The main characters are presented as people with a hidden inside animal, which rules them and brings them back to their predecessors in species evolution. The author shows the animal and shows that people are not far from animals, considered as lower creatures in comparison with a human. This outcome, when humans are seen as close relatives to animals with all their passions and basic instincts, is one of the most important bases of Zola's Naturalism.

In terms of Darwin's *Theory of Species* the idea of an animal present in each man is definitely derived from Darwin's concept of as a descendant of animals which evolved from each other over thousands of years and therefore the only logical and expectable outcome could be people sharing several basic characteristics with them. In Zola's literature temperaments are also strongly influenced by environment and their current situation. This literary characteristic follows Taine's philosophy of race, environment and moment.

Claiming himself a scientist, Zola insisted on a relationship between literature and science and the successful usage of scientific method should have become one of

the proofs that writing a novel is a scientific discipline as well as biology or philosophy, two branches of significant importance for Naturalism. Depiction of people's life stories should not be without application of certain scientific method into novel writing next time.

In order to apply the newest discoveries and methods naturalists explicitly emphasized their position and by following a quote of Paul Alexis, Zola's close friend defined their method as: "A way of thinking, of seeing, of reflecting, of studying, of making, experiments, a need to analyse in order to know, rather than a particular style of writing." (Furst, Skrine, 9) From this quote it is possible to assume that naturalists deal with every possible detail present in their works, everything must be carefully recorded with a scientific objectivity, so the description may serve as future analysis of 'the case' the author is studying at the moment.

Therefore the writers concentrated at *The Médan Group* brought observations, data collection and analysis into their novels. In several novels long specialized medical passages connected to psychology and the descriptions of clinical state of the 'patients' are present. Pathological cases who inherited criminal and vicious instincts were mostly the main characters of those books.

But as Harvey and Heseltine suggest, Zola's connection between the functions of psychologist and novelist was false. This falseness may lay in Zola's inspiration by Dr. Bernard and his experimental concept of medicine, but this connection could prove to be impossible, the approach being not scientific but only pseudo-scientific. The methods of observations, analysis and evidence were applied in a non-transparent way. Only pathological cases of characters were chosen by the authors. On top of that, Zola himself is accused of working rather tendentiously. According to the authors he collected his data very hastily and therefore they do not have the real scientific value. The collected material only supported his thesis. Thus his works could not be objective and can not be considered scientific. (Harvey, Heseltine, 508)

This conclusion may lead to objection that Naturalism does not represent the scientific approach as it intended originally. It suggests that Naturalism became only an unsuccessful attempt to enrich the literature of new methods which actually did not appear to be necessary and Naturalism proved to be a dead branch of literature at the end of the nineteenth century.

Another objection from the same critics heads to the dynamics of naturalistic novels. Because of the scientific approach, the Naturalistic novels lack action and the focus is on the method of writing. The novel should be a case history, serving as a document of the characters' development and analysis of the antecedents. (Harvey, Heseltine, 508) From almost any naturalistic novel it is obvious that long passages describing the conditions of character from the medical and psychological point of view are rather reader tiring and do not provide an eventuality of dynamic actions of the story. The problem of passivity is criticized by Zatloukal, too. He states that Zola's effort to change literature into exact science resulted into weakening of art, rigidity of the environment and passivity of characters moving inside this reality. On the other hand, *Germinal* is considered one of the great novels of Zola, where the epic has beaten the biological-deterministic theory. (Zatloukal, 316)

4.1 Naturalism and its form, subject matter and characters

From the formal and stylistic point of view, Naturalists did not bring anything new into the form of a novel, the writers kept the convenient nineteenth century form of it being developed by realistic writers. Apart from this, Zola's intentions did not lie in the experimentation with form but with a method and the man itself. According to Zatloukal, Zola's experimentation did not concern the form but the method of writing and therefore the form of any Naturalistic novel is clear and unexceptionable. Zatloukal further adds that according to Zola's principles, which he derived from works of his favourite predecessor in Realism Gustave Flaubert, a Naturalistic writer should apply impersonality, disinterestedness and insincerity. Thus the writer can achieve objectivity. (Zatloukal, 315 – 328)

Concerning the form of a naturalist novel, Lehan adds that the narrative mode of Naturalism is infused with historic reality and on condition of that Naturalism brings the heredity and environment into the narration sequences of cause and effect. (Lehan, 17)

Subject matter was obviously a much more significant topic for Naturalist than the form mentioned above. According to the philosophy of Taine, the race, moment and environment were important. Circumstances in which characters of naturalistic novels

can find themselves being thrown into are not these of pleasant nature. But those circumstances are crucial for the next course of their lives and the authors devote their full attention to the description of both the environment characters live in and the circumstances they find themselves into. Being precise in details, Naturalists depicted the social climate of the end of the nineteenth century in all its richness but on the other hand with its hypocrisy and contemptibility of some social classes they write about in their novels. Social outcasts standing as heroes of a novel were new feature that was brought into literature by Naturalism. Poverty, deprivation and incapability of better future expectations are characteristic for many naturalistic works. On the top of that, Naturalists described the impermeability of social classes and by examples in their novels emphasized the equality of all men no matter in which social class he belongs to. In terms of this, the working classes were not only the main characters of Naturalists. Even Zola himself wrote about upper classes in his *Les Rougon-Macquart Series*, his novels *L'Argent*, *Son Excellence Eugene Rougon*, *Une Page d'amour* serving as the evidence of this statement. To summarize it in Zola's own words, the writer should deal with a contemporary subject matter, to deal with the modern time and the truth of tomorrow. Moreover, the writer should be able to add the poetry which is hidden in everything people do, regardless of their nature (Weinberg, 209)

To comment on the main heroes of their books, Naturalists wanted to trace the process of evolution and its influence on a man in his current situation and environment but in relations with this, the characters often are not successful in finding their way of life with solved problems and the ends of naturalistic novels tend to be without proper conclusions and the reader leaves the characters expecting more struggle in their future circumstances.

5. A comparison of important issues in *Jude the Obscure* and *Germinal*

In terms of the aims of this thesis, several issues will be discussed separately in following chapters. The topics discussed are of vital importance for the Naturalistic school and doctrine and are based on the previous analysis of naturalistic sources accomplished in the first part of this work. Issues of genetic determination, Darwin's

Theory of Species, , social environment in terms of influencing the characters' lives and detailed description including medical and psychological analysis of the characters are the foundation blocks of Naturalistic novels and therefore will be examined. Because of Naturalists' special interest in love, sex and sexual life itself in terms of their connection to Darwin's *Theory*, previous items will be devoted a separate chapter, too. Each chapter is divided into two sub-parts, where *Jude the Obscure* and *Germinal* will be surveyed separately and followed by a brief conclusion summarizing the main similarities, influences or differences of compared novels.

5.1. Psychological analysis of novels' main characters

All the main characters of *Jude the Obscure* are psychological portrayals of a certain type of a man. According to Irving Howe, *Jude* is a novel dominated by psychology. (Howe, 403) Each of them is different and interesting. Jude, Sue, Phillotson and Arabella are persons with dominating features which forms them and give them their specialty.

Starting from the minor ones of these four, Phillotson and Arabella are not given so much space as the other two, but still they are easy to understand. Richard Phillotson is a sensitive man and was given an enormous portion of empathy. His understanding for Sue's unsettled character and her disturbances and frustration is almost immense. The way Phillotson let his wife leave with her lover can arouse strong pity for him but positive affections from a reader as well: "Their supreme desire is to be together – to share each other's emotions, and fancies, and dreams. [...] The more I reflect the more entirely I am on their side!" (Hardy, 1994, 276-277) Once Phillotson had decided to break his marriage with Sue, he considered his decision the only true one and he accepted her departure with "mild serenity at the sense that he was doing his duty by a woman who was at his mercy almost overpowered his grief at relinquishing her." (Hardy, 1994, 278) His understanding for Sue is immense and his kindness can be considered so great because of the suffering which the separation had brought him and even he must have been aware of the possible loss of his position as a schoolmaster he did not hesitate to let his wife go to make her happy.

Arabella functions as a contrast to these affections for others. Her only interest is that of herself and she does not have any regards for the people she deals with, all the

time she only pursues her goals. Hardy describes her as a selfish, sly creature, which can betray anybody and harm even her family because of her own profit. He gave her a very strong will, she is not a person influenced by the environment or the situation, she always can adapt well enough and find her way, reaching everything she had already decided to reach. Therefore we can read about her rejection of Little Father Time, whom she left in Australia and later he dumps him with Jude and Sue because her son could be a handicap in marrying her new man. Even though Arabella is jealous about Sue this fact can not prevent her from leaving her son: “I would have him with me here in a moment, but he is not old enough to be of any use in the bar, [...] and naturally Cartlett might think him in the way. (Hardy, 1994, 325) Her selfishness achieved the imaginary peak when she leaves dying Jude at home and does not care about his corpse because she had simply waited to his exit and after she is fully concentrated on her future affair with a village doctor:

“Putting his arms around her shoulders he kissed her there and then. [...] She let him out of the house, and as she went back she said to herself: ‘Well! Weak women must provide for a rainy day. And if my poor fellow upstairs do go off – as I suppose he will soon- it’s well to keep chances open.’” (Hardy, 1994, 481)

On the other hand Jude and Sue are described as much more complicated persons. They function as products of their time period. They are strong individualities but tempted by their fears and dreams. Jude is broken apart by his passion for learning and a family life with his beloved Sue.

Jude can be seen as a man of strong personal principles, which are unfortunately not the same as the principles of the major of people. Inside Jude fights between his instincts Nature endowed him with against his principles. Howe claims that he is much aware of this fact, opposing strongly to his own nature. He is internally very similar to Sue, struggling with the same sensibility and idealism, being one of the first of those working intellectuals. Therefore he continuously disturbs himself and his inside feelings are more important for him than what happens around him. (Howe, 400) Jude is a very emphatic person reigned by his love to Sue. In his eyes he tries to accomplish everything which could help her to be happy and satisfied. Practicing the wedding ceremony with her before her marriage with Phillotson costs a lot of Jude’s effort but this irrational quest being Sue’s great wish, Jude did not hesitate to fulfill it. On the

other hand his naive character drove him into arms of Arabella, trusting her little fraud with pregnancy. Jude's honesty causes him a lot of suffering, the purity of his spirit is easily abused and Arabella did it twice during his life, which resulted into complicated situations for Jude. Because of all the turn outs and unhappiness Jude became more and more sensitive and psychically disturbed, but he never feels such distractions as his lover.

Sue is tortured by her nerves, these being of weak constitution and continuously tightened by her unhappy life situation. She is a clever girl of smart thinking and modern ideas about religion and world at all, but on the other hand she is damaged by her neurosis which causes a lot of trouble not only to her but to her close friends or family members as well. Irving Howe managed to sum this up into one short sentence: "She is a promethean in mind but masochist in character." (Howe, 401) Her attitude to sex is the one connected to masochism, denying his bodily pleasure to both her husbands at first to return to Phillotson giving him what he longs for at the end, but with obvious self-denial and immense aversion. Even though she is considered charming by both Jude and Phillotson, she lacks sexuality and femaleness or body and flesh. In this characteristic she is a counterpart of Arabella, whose animality serves her as a sign for men and which helps her to win the men on her side, not Sue's.

In her mind Sue is chased by strong impulses which attack one another. She is a very sensible person and perceives everything very strongly. At the same time her sensibility does not get along with the openness of her senses. In the time of nervous strain, Sue turns to herself and regrets herself as an unhappy and suffering woman: "Sue was always much affected at a picture of herself as an object of pity, and she saddened." (Hardy, 1994, 355) After the nervous wreck she suffered after the sudden loss of her two babies, she found consolation in religion and God. It is another nature of her spirit, her sensibility is turned to Lord. She regularly visits a nearby church of St. Silas and being witnessed by her landlady who confirmed her new affections for God lasting for few weeks:

"The prevalent silence seemed to contain a faint sound, explicable as breathing, or a sobbing, which came from the other end of the building. [...] High overhead, above the chancel steps, Jude could see a solid Latin cross [...] Underneath, upon the floor, lay what appeared to be a heap of black clothes, and from this was repeated the sobbing that he had heard before." (Hardy, 1994, 417-418)

On top of that, Sue sees the death of her children who were killed by her step son Little Father Time as a judgment of her and Jude's mistakes: "The right slaying the wrong." (Hardy, 1994, 419) Her sudden religiosity is elicited by a deep grief and led to complete change of Sue's feelings and attitudes. From a woman of reason and paganism Sue becomes a religious and conventional woman with no ambitions.

The affection Jude and Sue had each other was not based on sex but on deep understanding in terms of their ideas, Howe calls it "a companion of nerves." (Howe, 401) They are kind, desperate and hopeless, wrecked by the society's norms and conventions. Their characters are suffering from sudden changes, especially in Sue's case and because of these sudden changes of her spirit they are unable to maintain their family.

In *Germinal* Zola draws his characters with no lesser effort than Hardy does in his novel. Etienne, Catherine, Chaval, Maheus, Levaques, Pierons and all the gentry are portrayed in detail. Etienne is chased by his desire to achieve great things, Catherine is distracted by her honesty and ungratefulness to her parents on the other side. Chaval is a sly creature thinking of his own profit mainly and all the miners' families struggle with a luxury of their credit or picture among their neighbours, and their effort to survive. The gentry are depicted as a group of snobs who are indifferent to problems of ordinary people and are born as hypocrites.

Etienne is an honest man hunted by his ideas and intellectualism, his psychological profile is the most detailed one of all the main characters' descriptions. This man with great intellect tries to pursue his goal of improving the miners' social conditions, believing in their right for a well-deserved wage. Even though his will is firmly set about this objective, he often doubts the decision to enter a strike, especially after the starvation appeared and violence broke out. Etienne's devotion to his quest is unquestioned as well as his effort to avoid plundering and attacking the gentry's private property. He is a very sympathetic man who feels for the suffering of the miners. On top of that, his charismatic personality and his inflame Etienne devoted to the miners' struggle for better working conditions raise colliers from their lethargy. Thus he

delivered a speech of great importance which influenced and encouraged all the miners in their strike, when he:

“gripped the attention of his audience; while his gestures also had an extra-ordinary effect on the comrades, the gestures of a man at work, [...] Everyone said the same: he wasn’t great speaker but he made you listen.” (Zola, 2004, 283)

His strong will forces him to study every possible material he can reach at, his companions and fellow-leaders giving him lots of articles and books about socialism and revolutionary art, which were just after their birth at the end of the nineteenth century and were becoming very popular among working class people. Etienne longed for education, his intellect allowed him to absorb new information naturally and his expanding knowledge brings him wide respect and credit among his fellow-workers.

Etienne’s affair with Catherine came through long metamorphosis containing happy moments of pure friendship as well as jealousy and animal lust for each other. But every time Etienne felt deep affection for Catherine, regretting her unhappy fate: “‘My poor little thing,’ Etienne said softly, suddenly feeling a great pity for her.” (Zola, 2004, 414) Even though his feelings towards this girl were so permanent and Etienne could not prevent himself from loving Catherine, he stayed reasonable: “His heart was breaking, but he had little better to offer her himself: a life of poverty, a life on the run.” (Zola, 2004, 415) His character is affected by all the turbulences of his life episode in the mining village, but his honesty and modesty, empathy, friendship and strong will force him to become a leader of thousand people who followed him for his ability to help and sacrifice himself.

Catherine is a teenage girl, fifteen already, who is resigned to her fate and accepts reality with no great expectations. She is a very sensitive girl who is abused by her man, as she calls him, Chaval, who took her as the first one and with whom she started to live with instead of her parents. She blames herself for her unhappiness: “If you only knew what a useless specimen I am. I hardly weigh more than tuppenny tub of butter, and I think the way I’m made I’ll never be a proper women.” (Zola, 2004, 414) She does not value herself too much, she even got used to violence with which Chaval punished her for her supposed infidelity and she considers herself a happy woman if Chaval marries her one day:

“Besides, she was getting used to the beatings, and she told herself by the way of consolation that eight out of ten girls ended up no better off than she was. And if he married her some day, well, that would actually be quite decent of him.” [Zola, 415]

She does not feel any despair for her false hopes and imaginations. Catherine abandoned ideas of a better life situation and reconciles with her fate. She is caught between two men, unable to decide finally which one to choose. Later in the shaft she admits her feelings: “I’d forbidden myself to think about you. I kept telling myself it was all over between us. But deep down I knew that one day sooner or later we’d be together.” (Zola, 2004, 517) Although her affections for Etienne are strong, after living with Chaval she rejects another man:

“And so, still without ever having kissed, they drew back, parted by their modesty of old, which was a mixture of angry resentment, physical reserve and a great deal of friendship.” (Zola, 2004, 414)

Etienne and Catherine’s relationship enters a new platonic stage, in which both of them are partly unhappy but do not wish to spoil their affections for each other and rather prefer a pure relationship. Finally in the pit shaft they let the other to love him or her and before Catherine’s death they one spend a night in the darkness as a couple.

Catherine’s views on the strike are diametrically different from those of her family. Catherine does not understand the reasons of the strike, she is used to working and does not see the consequences. Her feelings for strikers are those of misunderstanding and rejection but in case of Etienne and her family she feels sorrow for their unbearable situation. Catherine is a complicated character with of suppressed passion, who is used to obey rules and order and behave according to widely accepted social conventions. Her inside feeling are controlled by her reasonability and her good manners prevent her from disobediences. But even Catherine can be caught in a rebellion during the strike, when her feelings exploded for a while. This explosion was stronger because of her usual calmness, the feelings of hopelessness grading calmly inside.

Two more characters are described in the following paragraph. Maheu and La Maheude are important figures of Zola’s work and therefore can not be omitted from the analysis. Maheu is a fair, honest and hardworking as well as responsible man in terms of the mine work. In the story he is presented as a positive hero with an undeserved fate

whose story should raise pity in a reader's mind. The same can be told about his wife. Both of them were not the most radical ones in the terms of the strike. But both of them suffered terrible losses. Maheu himself was shot in the riot with soldiers near the mine, his wife was deeply wounded by the loss of her two children, Alzire died of starvation during the strike and Zacharie caused an explosion because of his carelessness when trying to save his sister, Catherine. This tragedy exposed La Maheude to a terrible situation but its peak was about to come. The accident in the mine caused the death of Catherine, who spent almost two weeks starving in the cave-in, dying two days before her companion Etienne was saved finally. But one of the most distinctive feature of La Maheude was her reasonability. Several months after the tragedy she had come back to work at the age of forty and was getting used to her new situation: "She now talked quite easily about those she had lost, [...] She was once again the calm, reasonable woman she used to be, always able to take a sensible view of things." (Zola, 2004, 526)

5.1.1. Conclusion

Main characters in both novels are portrayed in a detailed way and are in many features similar to each other. Moreover, the storylines of both novels are spiced by a sexual triangle caused by psychic qualities of heroines. Sue and Catherine are powerlessly trapped between two men, unable to choose the right one and driven into arms of the one or the other by a consequence in combination with the conventions of society. These unfortunate heroines are accompanied by men whose education is essential for their lives. Phillotson, Jude and Etienne are dependent on their progress in knowledge and studying gives them a perspective for their lives. For Etienne it is even more apparent. As Pearson summarizes this issue, Etienne used to be ignorant entering Montsou and miners' work. Leaving caught him in the state of raised knowledge and a dream to meet. [Pearson, xxxviii] Jude and Etienne would like to become movers of social development, both of them consider the education a key for this progress, but their effort is not successful and they suffer from the rejection of the society surrounding them.

Both Hardy and Zola use several women characters contrasting of personalities. In *Germinal* Catherine and La Moquette, in *Jude the Obscure* Sue and Arabella face each other being perfect opposites in their personalities and psychic qualities. Arabella and

La Moquette are firstly females who represent physical instincts attracting men to them. They do not care about conventions and are able to do what ever to reach for their object of desire. Moreover Frederick McDowel claims that both Arabella and La Moquette function as catalysts between their rivals and their men. (McDowel, 437) On the other hand Sue and Catherine are ruled by conventions either themselves or the ones society is expecting of them. Neither Sue nor Catherine is able to make a final decision unless a situation presses them or makes the decision itself. Both Sue and Catherine are suffering from their obedience and adversity of fate. But all the time they are not willing to assume the full responsibility of their future lives. This is typically naturalistic, their lives are dominated by the outer reality, people just expecting what the life will bring them.

Sue is exceptional in terms of her neurosis, which Hardy tried to connect with her sexual disorders. According to Albert Guerard Hardy's aim was to show the connection between the neurosis and its relationship to modern society, in other words he presented neurosis as a product of social forces. (Guerard, 426) Catherine is not fully physically mature, she has some physical disorders as well. She does not feel like a woman because of the absence of her period. The differences between these heroines are insignificant and these function mostly as indicators of their own character qualities. Generally they meet the same function in the storylines and present similar qualities.

5.2. Impact of sciences, analytic approach

French Naturalists believed in the modern sciences and genetic determination became a base for their novel writing. Declaring the genetic transmission guilty of the weakest and lowest qualities of characters, the naturalistic writers found genetics responsible for their characters' behaviour. Darwin's *Theory of Species* influenced them in their analysis as well. The last part of this chapter is a sub-part focused on objectivity, because this was the goal Naturalists tried to achieve and all the scientific knowledge should help them to achieve this and therefore it should be commented as well.

5. 2.1. Genetic determination

Both Jude, in *Jude the Obscure*, and Étienne, in *Germinal*, have drinking in their "blood", because they inherited it from their predecessors and are not able to fight it in a

successful and satisfying way. On the following pages their preconditions for addiction will be discussed and compared. For Zola, there are more aspects of genetic determination to be commented on.

Jude himself is aware of his preconditions for drinking alcohol. Trying to avoid public houses, inns and prevent himself from becoming addicted on drinking, he is not able to fulfill his resolutions and during a deep crisis in his life, Jude tends to take alcohol as a means of forgetting:

“What was there less noble, more in keeping with his present degraded position? He could get drunk. [...] Drinking was the regular stereotyped resource of the despairing worthless. He began to see now why some men boozed at inns. [...] He called for liquor and drank briskly for an hour or more. (Hardy, 1994, 82)

Later on, after an unsuccessful attempt to enter the university as a scholar, Jude is once again found drinking heavily in Christminster’s Inn, being encouraged by his stone mason colleagues and challenged to prove his knowledge of Latin passages in the Bible by two undergraduates visitors of this inn: “Well, come now, stand me a small Scotch cold, and I’ll do it straight off.” (Hardy, 1994, 145)

Jude became conscious of his problems with alcohol and feeling terrible the day after, he made confession to a young prelate visiting his great-aunt: “... a fellow gone to the bad; [...] Now I am melancholy mad, what with drinking and one thing another.” (Hardy, 1994, 150) A prompt answer was given by the young priest, warning him against drinking: “Only you must make up your mind to avoid strong drink.” (Hardy, 1994, 150) Jude’s reply came immediately: “I could avoid that easily enough, if I had any kind of hope to support me!” (Hardy, 1994, 150)

The possible hope which could prevent Jude from drinking, was found firstly in entering the Church as a licentiate, secondly in happy life with Sue. But if any tragic moment appeared or crisis developed, Jude fled back from his problems and hid himself in the armful of alcohol. Therefore when he and Sue were departing, he warned his lover of abandoning him, claiming that means ruining him and letting himself be consummated by his alcohol inclination:

“Stay with me for a humanity’s sake! You know what a weak fellow I am. My two Arch Enemies you know – my weakness for a womankind and my impulse for a strong liquor. Don’t abandon me to them, Sue, to

save your own soul only! They have been kept entirely at a distance since you became my guardian angel! (Hardy, 1994, 423)

Unable to fight with his demon, Jude is finally captured by it, when Arabella and his father planned the restoration of their marriage. Helping Jude to a terrible drunkenness, Arabella ushered her ex-husband to her father's house and appealed to him that their next goal is to: "... keep him jolly and cheerful here for a day or two, and not let him go back to his lodging." (Hardy, 1994, 453) This misuse of Jude's weakness lowers Arabella's effort to persuade Jude to remarry her once again. The reason of her rudeness might be her awareness of Jude's lack of interest in a wedding and on the top of the fact that Arabella knows how deep Jude's love for Sue was and that this passionate affection would have prevented him from marrying another woman being in a right state of his mind.

Alcohol functions as an inherited quality, even though readers do not recognize who this demon is inherited from. Hardy's claim that Jude has it in his blood seems therefore vague and uncertain. No predecessors with alcohol addiction were described, no proof for supporting his statement was given either. Despite this, his passion for drinking, even though it is precisely hidden and for a long time well controlled, could have ruined Jude's life if Jude had not be aware of the malicious effect alcohol has on him.

Unfortunately, alcohol is not the only problematic issue of inheritance. Jude's great aunt, Drussila Fawley, warns her great nephew against marriage, stating that:

"The Fawleys were not made for wedlock: it never seemed to sit upon us. There's sommat in our blood that won't take kindly to the notion of being bound to do what we do readily enough if not bound." (Hardy, 1994, 82)

She explained further to Jude what happened with his parents and the reason of their parting: "Your father and mother couldn't get together, and they parted." (Hardy, 1994, 82) Then she added the cause of death of Jude's mother – she drowned soon after she parted with Jude's father. His aunt warned Jude from contacting his cousin, mentioning it would cause problems to both of them and she expressed her worries that Sue: "med bring you to ruin." (Hardy, 1994, 133)

This stigmatization leaves a trace on the descendants of Fawleys' family, Jude and Sue. Bearing in mind the fate of their parents, Sue being brought up by her father alone,

too, the two lovers were resistant to marry and therefore lived without an approval of legal laws. Moreover Sue rejected another marriage with Jude because of her previous unsuccessful marriage with Richard Phillotson, some twenty years older headmaster of a village school.

On top of that Jude's first marriage ended in a disaster as well. Marrying a sensuous woman of rude and foxy manner, Arabella Donn, meant spoiling Jude's expectations for a life as a scholar in Christminster and affected him negatively in terms of marriage.

Therefore both the main characters, Jude and Sue, have strong prejudices against marriage. At the beginning of their story, Jude was afraid of marrying Sue because of his wrong experiences as well as his prejudices and Sue being his cousin:

“It was not well for cousin to fall in love even when circumstances seemed to favour the passion. [...] even were he free, in a family like his own where marriage usually meant a tragic sadness, marriage with a blood-relation would duplicate the adverse conditions, and a tragic sadness might be intensified to a tragic horror.” (Hardy, 1994, 107)

Later after Sue's divorce with Phillotson, Jude accepted the wedding as a legal act and kindly expected to marry Sue. But Sue refused to marry Jude several times during the story. She reacted in an uninterested manner on Jude's proposal after she was delivered the nullification with her first husband: “I have just the same dread lest an iron contract should extinguish your tenderness for me, and mine for you, as it did between our unfortunate parents.” (Hardy, 1994, 307) Finally her jealousy caused change of mind and Sue agreed to marry Jude. But on their way to the wedding she got distressed:

“I wish I hadn't promised to you to let you put up the banns this morning. [...] Jude, do you think that when you *must* have me with you by law, we shall be so happy as we are now? The men and women of our family are very generous when everything depends upon their good will, but they always kick against compulsion. (Hardy, 1994, 322 – 323)

Particularly she did not like the idea of being married not in church but only in a common office of a village or town council. In her eyes the love was degraded by such a civil act, where one pair was followed by another, the people often came drunk or directly from prison.

Sue and Jude's view on marriage underwent several violent turnarounds. Their opinions changed and oscillated. Sue's final rigid position was influenced by her and

Jude's unhappy experiences. Despite of her previous unhappy coexistence with his ex-husband, Sue remarried Richard Phillotson, this sudden twist being caused by her sudden religionism, which she neglected at the beginning as an emancipated, modern, *new* woman. Jude's position on a marriage with a cousin was purely negative firstly, but after living together with his lover he felt that legalization could help their union. Feeling a deep affection for his relation, Jude resigned on his prejudices about inheritance of this quality genetically from his parents and Sue from hers. Apart from his great aunt's assurance that Fawley family members can not have a happy marriages Hardy does not provide any genetic reference for this prejudice. It may seem that in his novel writing it could be considered either a belief in modern sciences or it may represent a kind of fatalism in which people tend to believe in the countryside. Hardy himself admits his interest in unusual and irrational, he believes that these are the principles of the universe. (Pinion, 159)

Zola's aim to document a history of French historical epoch of the second empire on the history of the Rougon-Macquart family should have proved the shame and disgrace of the empire and its decline, which should have been illustrated on this particular family. Warning reminds us that it was the heredity, which was seen as an indicator of the family's decline as well as the decadence of the empire. He further suggests that the genealogical tree on which Zola shows the decline of the Rougon-Macquart family is at the same time following "the path of a kingly race which fascinates precisely in its madness." (Warning, 707) Zola's effort to prove the hereditary impact of disease, insanity or alcoholism as well as inclination to violence and brutality is obvious from the genealogical tree he draws in the first novel of the Rougon-Macquart series. Warning further adds that it was here, where Zola traced the first malice and determining moment of the family's history. The first symptom of insanity occurred when a marriage between Adelaide Rougon marries her gardeneer, Macquart, whose Aunt Dide, a woman from lower class coming from peasant family in Provence brought the insanity and other genetically transmissible defects. (Warning, 708)

Zola's main character in *Germinal*, Étienne Lantier, inherited an affection for alcohol and an inclination to violence. His mother, a laundry woman, as he calls her, is Gervaise Macquart, a woman whose husband brought more alcoholism and brutality

into the family. (Woehr) Both malign influences have their origin in the genealogy of his family's predecessors and can be traced in the genealogic tree. This kind of addiction has not already overtaken him but it has caused serious problems on his life so far. Even though he is aware of his "predisposition to murderous, alcoholic rage, which he carries in his blood," (Pearson, xxviii) he rejects his fate, looking for better life. Even he tries hard to control his demon, several times he is overcome by it and every time it has fatal consequences for him. In a dialogue with Catherine, shortly after their first meeting in the mine, Etienne admits he was sacked from his previous job because he had a fight with his boss and that drinking was responsible for his sudden burst out of violence: "I can't even have two tiny glasses of the stuff without wanting to have a go at someone." (Zola, 2004, 47) He is aware of his problems which might occur when drinking and tries to avoid alcohol, knowing what it caused to his family:

"he hated alcohol with the hatred of one who was the last in a long line of drunks and who suffered in his flesh from this wild, drink sodden inheritance, to such an extent that the merest drop had become the equivalent of poison for him." (Zola, 2004, 47)

Rivalry with Chaval, the man Catherine lives with, leads Etienne to his suppressed and controlled instincts so far, but once being provoked, he can not prevent himself from entering his dark part of character: "It surged up from his entrails and pounded inside his skull, a sudden, crazed desire to kill, a desperate thirst for blood." (Zola, 2004, 412) After killing his rival in love down in the mine during the cave in of Le Voreux, Etienne is shocked by his behaviour and thinks of the hard struggle he led against his urge to kill:

"memories of long, futile battle against the poison that lay dormant in every sinew of his body, the alcohol which had slowly accumulated over the generations in his family's blood. And as if he was drunk now, it could only be hunger: his parents' alcoholism had sufficed at one remove." (Zola, 2004, 510)

All these evidences of heredity and genetic transmission are influenced by the medicalization of French culture, which was full of new discoveries in medicine and physiology. (Conti, 4)

But not only psychic phenomena are that of Zola's interest. Apart from alcoholism and an urge to kill, he deals with physical appearance inherited or developed by

genetics. Thus a reader can be acknowledged by an appearance of Maheus' children who are affected by a long line of predecessors working in a mine, which left significant traces on them. They are not nice, people view them as creatures rather than children: "thinking them perfectly frightful with their excessively large heads and their mops of straw-coloured hair. (Zola, 2004, 108) Another description is that of Alzire, the eight year old daughter of Maheus: "they could not help staring at the poor little cripple with uneasy sympathy." (Zola, 2004, 109) Jeanlin, their son, is considered "degenerated offspring of a destitute breed." (Zola, 2004, 193) Long generation of miners left their traces on their descendants, their physical appearance being influenced negatively by the work in a mine.

As current research reveals alcoholism can be really transmitted via genomes and therefore can be inherited as a predisposition. Zola's effort to prove this seems easy to defend. Zola's interest in natural sciences and his effort to apply them in literature was not acquired with understanding but from today's point of view it is natural. Hardy did not mean to be such a scientist even though he intended his novels to be Naturalistic. In his books he stayed more a novelist than scientist and although he was acknowledged with works of John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer he was influenced by his belief in 'Nature' more. In Hardy's case his try of scientific approach is a mixture of belief in unusual and irrational and results of modern sciences and philosophy.

5.2.2. Darwinism, humans perceived as animals' descendants

Naturalists consider people descendants of animals and therefore are persuaded of similarities between these two familiar groups. Naturalistic novels are usually full of allusions to animal instincts which were transferred from animals to people by natural development.

In *Jude the Obscure* Hardy confirms the Naturalistic form of this novel by his choice of scenes. Thus we can read about the pig killing scene, in which Jude is unable to deal with pig-killing quickly and immediately: "The dying animal's cry assumed its third and final tone, the shriek of agony; his glazing eyes riveting themselves on Arabella." (Hardy, 1994, 76) As Mizener comments on this scene, the pig is an object of naturalism, but at the same time it has its own specific symbolic value. (Mizener, 406) It

symbolizes Jude's inability to do any living creature any harm as well as his own life story. But that will be discussed separately in another subpart of this chapter. From the point of view of naturalism, this scene illustrates that for Jude every living creature deserves a sensible approach, all the living ones being equal to each other. His feelings for the pig are those of sincere sorrow of losing a life of almost a friend, who had been fed and now is betrayed by his only friends. Rooks consuming Farmer Troutham's corn with Jude's protection, because he does not wish them to starve, provide for the same situation and viewpoint of the author as previous example with the pig.

“'Poor little dears!' said Jude, aloud. 'You shall have some dinner – you shall. There is enough for us all. Farmer Troutham can afford to let you have some. Eat, then my little birdies, and make a good meal!'” (Hardy, 1994, 11)

Again Jude's compassion for them is stronger than his responsibility for his task, which is to frighten them in order not to allow them to eat the corn. Mizener claims, that Hardy's “defence and salvation” of the body does not allow him any other interpretations of his opinions. (Mizener, 407)

In Hardy's novel no more examples of referencing to Darwin can be found. Even the already mentioned example is of rather vague value of Hardy's involvement in Darwin's *Theory*. On the other hand the statement that the fittest survives is definitely valid in *Jude the Obscure*. Both Jude and Sue are defeated by the stronger ones in the society later on, themselves being the less healthy both physically and mentally and resistant to their unhappy fate. On the other hand Arabella is the survivor who can adapt to changed conditions and circumstances, fighting for survival and her happiness. As already said, the fittest survives.

Zola compares people and animals directly. His various comments or short allusions express his fundamental belief in Darwin's *Theory of Species* and its principles. Several characters, male as well as female, are overtaken by their deeply hidden instincts in their crisis or stressful situation. Unable to solve the situation rationally they tend to hid behind their predecessors of the lower level in the line of development. Thus a reader can witness scenes of jealousy, defending one's territory or unexpected brutality. Chaval, Jeanlin (a son of Maheus) or Etienne himself are the best examples Zola draw in his novel.

Etienne and Chaval, two important characters in terms of discovering animal features of people, have similar demons. Both of them are obsessively jealous, but an ability to control themselves and an effort not to burst out in a wild quiver of jealousy makes the difference between them.

Unlike Etienne, Chaval is not able to control himself, he is a brute ruled by his jealousy which finally causes his death. But long before he treated Catherine with cruelty unworthy of a man. His jealousy is connected with a guarding of a territory, as males do in a wild nature. His unexpected visit in the house of Maheus where their daughter came after several months to support them with some food supplies, provokes almost a riot between Chaval and Etienne. Chaval's possessive behaviour and violence he treated Catherine with because of his jealousy seems unbearable to Etienne. In his fury, Chaval accuses Catherine of adultery and La Maheude of helping them in their misbehaviour: "And a fine job you do, keeping watch for her while your slut of a daughter is lying upstairs with her legs in the air." (Zola, 2004, 234) Etienne felt embarrassed for Catherine and furious because of the injustice spoken which was of him: "the two men stood face to face, with blood in their eyes. There was an ancient hatred, a long, unspoken, jealous rivalry, and it burst into the open." (Zola, 2004, 234) But this time the row should not be solved and therefore Chaval and Etienne met again in the bar where they intended to fight again, supported by the audience: "so let the fittest survive." (Zola, 2004: 408) This is a direct reference for Darwin's *Theory*. Only the stronger one can survive and the fight is an inevitable part of the struggle for the victory. These two men do not fight for the purest survival of theirs but their affection for one woman made them fight for her favour and love or body as well.

Jeanlin is a ten-year-old boy whose only goal is to stay alive and adapt to impaired conditions of their lives. Being one of the last in a long line of miners, he was degenerated by this profession and this could be seen on his bodily constitution, his animality being apparent to Zola's eyes:

"looking like some old monkey with his yellow hair and big ears and his thin, pointed face with his little green eyes that glowed in the dark. Unnaturally precocious for his years, he seemed to have the instinctual intelligence and quick dexterity of some freakish human runt which had reverted to its original animal state." (Zola, 2004, 188)

The circumstances and the mine made him a sly creature who abused his friends in his own benefit. The situation had been changing him slowly but gradually, living and hiding down the old pit shaft sharpened his deeply hidden instincts and abilities of an animal inside of him: “He looked at Jeanlin, [...] a degenerate throwback possessed of intuitive intelligence and native cunning who was gradually reverting to his former animal state.” (Zola, 2004 276)

Later on after the tragedy of cave-in of ‘le Voreux’ he watches the rescue works very carefully because probably they may result in discovery of his cover: “Jeanlin, too, on seeing that his den was being invaded, and been prowling around with the frightened look of an animal whose burrow [...] is about to be uncovered.” (Zola, 2004, 487) As an animal he guards his territory fearing the loss of it as a loss of a male losing his dominance among his herd in wild nature.

Men are not the only ones affected by their inheritance after animal predecessors. Women changed to a herd of maddened and furious animals during the strike in times of terrible starvation: „Every one of them in the grip of a murderous frenzy, baring tooth and claw and snarling like dogs.“ (Zola, 2004, 359) Starvation deprived them of their human qualities and the animal ones were left to them only. In case of the crisis the deeply hidden instincts appeared to protect the whole life.

In terms of women, Zola is obsessed with another feature reminding him of their animality. Frequent allusions made by him concerns women’s breasts, comparing them with animals’: “she had calmly exposed a breast like an obliging animal ready to give suck, [...] as though elongated by the steady supply of milk welling like a spring within.” (Zola, 2004, 111) This comparison may be at least provoking even in the time period of the twenty first century, matrimony being considered one of the most intimate area of women’s life. The manner Zola spoke about it may be considered rude and rather offensive. On the other hand the fact is that from his point of view, the scientific one, people were just descendants of animals and therefore breast feeding of babies should not be perceived as anything to be ashamed of, when people are just another kind of mammals.

Zola devoted his final pages of the book to the evaluation of people’s possibilities and his consideration concerns the struggle in society. This is according to him ruled by Darwin’s *Theory*:

“would the world forever be a battleground on which the strong devoured the weak in pursuit of the perfection and continuity of the species? [...] his first speech would be devoted to Darwin’s theory. If one class had to devour the other, then surely it was the people, still young and hardy, which would devour a bourgeoisie that had worn itself out in self-gratification: new blood would mean a new society” (Zola, 2004, 529 – 530)

Zola’s ideas about the hierarchy of society are obvious from this last quotation. He had a strong social feeling for his heroes from lower working classes and his revolutionary ideas brought him to a conclusion that the battle is inevitable. Influenced by a rising socialist movement, he seems to be blinded by his concepts of socially fair world in which everybody will live in peace. But at the same time he must have been aware of the fact this is just a dream of a man who does not see consequences as we see in our post modern age.

5.2.3. *Objectivity*

Naturalists experimented with science in order to achieve objectivity of their novels or drama works. It is supposed that their interest in objectivity rose from their preference of Positivism. But to which extent did the writers manage to achieve their main goal? This subpart’s goal is to find an answer for the previous question.

The pig-killing scene described in chapter 2.2.2. illustrates how a lack of objectivity can be explored easily in Hardy’s novel. While Jude considers the slow killing of the pig cruel and inhuman, Arabella’s main concern is that of economy and profit from the pig. According to Mizener, a reader’s sympathy for Arabella is precluded because of the choice of words and the effect the scene has on a reader, arousing pity for both pig and Jude. (Mizener, 406) But from Arabella’s point of view, why not to do the bleeding properly to gain as much money as possible for it? Hardy does not defend this viewpoint even on few lines to let a reader make his or her own mind concerning this dispute. Therefore this method can not be found objective. Moreover analysis was not developed carefully and does not concern different viewpoints.

Unfortunately this is not the only example. Jude’s protection of rooks, allowing them to eat Farmer Troutham’s corn, supplements previous objections. Again only the viewpoint of Jude is presented by Hardy, Farmers’ business interests are not mentioned.

And once again the reader is not provided neutral words but only words of positive connotations towards the little birds, being considered only thieves and affecting negatively Farmer's profit. To summarize previous objections concerning Hardy's objectivity, Hardy does not justify Arabella's and Farmer's viewpoints because "he cannot present two kinds of truth in a naturalistic novel." (Mizener, 407)

Zola's objectivity is an object of criticism as well. For example Furst and Skrine state, that he does not remain objective because of his choice of situations or characters. (Furst, Skrine, 45) According to them, Zola does not proceed analytically and without compassion for a concrete person or circumstance. His description of a rampaging and plundering crowd of starving miners and their families elicits sympathy in a reader, omitting the fact that such behaviour should be considered illegal and should not be approved. Even though the Company's policy towards workers may not be considered fair in current conditions, Zola did not offer any space for justification of bourgeoisie's and Company's point of view. The situations are presented only from the miners' points of view which are evidently preferred by Zola. The preference in literature is possible but not in the case in which objectivity is perceived as a main criterion of a literary movement. According to Weinberg, Zola's main aim was to find the truth, thus the work could be created only in conditions of precise research of the outer reality. Only by close focus on realities of his day the writer could contribute to a detection of the true reality. Science and analytic method should help a writer to achieve his only goal that should occur in modern literature, truth. (Weinberg, 208 – 211) But the approach of Zola, as shown in previous reference to his book, can not be found analytic and scientific. He did not equally distribute space for justification of all the opinions that could appear in the book, but allowed only his own ideas and feelings to be presented through his characters. Thus his desired objectivity can not be considered real but his work with sources and notes from observations are misleading and the results can be even the misinterpretation of the data. As Warning concludes, it is impossible to use the genealogic tree to tell the story of the empire as the story of a cultural catastrophe. The image of "special blood of the kingdom of the Rougon-Macquart deconstructs the opposition of health and illnesses. This imagery is removed from positivistic epistemes." (Warning, 712)

5.2.4. Conclusion

To evaluate writers' approach to sciences, which definitely influenced both Zola and Hardy, may be difficult. All the examples gathered through the pages of both novels are used as illustration of this thesis' ideas. The only unbreakable conclusion is that both writers are concerned about science and its latest outcomes and that both knew the crucial ideas that influenced them. But the degree of such an influence is different. While Zola includes every source of Naturalism precisely and keeps on its doctrine with obstinate persistence, Hardy's approach is looser or in other words he is not sticking to every possible detail mentioned by Zola in his explanation what Naturalism means.

The question of heredity is important in both novels. The difference lays in the degree of incorporation of analysis and scientific approach, as was already mentioned. Zola believed in principles of modern medicine while Hardy was more influenced by his belief in Nature and its never ending logic. According to Mizener this was a much deeper belief which could not be easily and quickly overcome by new scientific knowledge. (Mizener, 404) On the other hand it seems that his knowledge went together with Hardy's personal belief and this may be the reason why he accepted doctrines of Naturalism. Zola's analysis of his characters' is as detailed as Hardy's, it is supposed that both were influenced by the new outcomes from medicines which were based on observations.

Considering the influence of Darwin's *Theory of Species* it is possible to state that in Zola's work there are much more visible examples. Therefore we can assume that this was not so important for Hardy. In spite of this outcome Hardy seems to be touched by this *Theory* a little at least. His allusions on animals as pigs or rooks or the life Sue and Jude had to lead as hunted animals because of disrespect of their neighbours and people surrounding them could be considered an evidence of his interest in this topic. It is possible to talk about social Darwinism, which was developed in coordination of Positivist, who viewed sociology as a biology of people's society and who predicted, that this is the next important field of science which should be discovered now. The impermeability of social classes is an object of Positivists' criticism whose ideas Zola was influenced by. Hardy's depiction of system of social classes is influenced by Social Darwinism. The impermeability of social classes is one of the most important parts of Hardy's criticism.

Zola goes deeper in his comparison of people to animals. He does it more directly, persuading the reader about the truth of this *Theory*. His choice of stylistic means is therefore turned to sharper words, some passages may still be offensive for a reader even today. Warning adds, that Zola's intended objectivity brought him to the use of denotative words which carry associations, connotations, metonymies, metaphors etc. (Warning, 724) According to Pearson the main feature of his approach is the dehumanization of a life in the terrible living conditions where people are reduced to the level of animals. [Pearson, xxxii] As it can be assumed from next chapters' excerpt, both authors let their heroes be touched by 'nature' or the animality. Thus Sue can not help herself from flirting with Jude even though she did not intend to and Jude can not prevent himself from being attracted to Arabella although he does not consider her a good woman and grateful wife. Similarly, Zola let his hero Etienne be attracted to Catherine and to La Moquette as well, because he can not overcome his instincts.

At the same time Zola believes in education, because there is naturally a seed of betterment in everyone of us and therefore the progress can be expected. Human beings can learn and this is the distinctive feature which differ people from animals. The information learned once is genetically transmissible. But the development is dependent on circumstances. And according to Zola people will stay people, which means animals and be good or bad. Their personal development or a change from good to bad or vice versa will be influenced by the environment and a situation. (Pearson, xxx – xxxiv)

Objectivity proved to be the weaker point of Naturalism. In subchapter 2.2.3. it was clarified that several examples of unbalanced opinions exist in both texts. Both Zola and Hardy failed in the main criterion of Naturalism. Connection between literature together with science and its methods did not prove to be successful because of violation of basic doctrinal features of the literary movement.

5.3. Sex and love - deep rooted passions

Jude the Obscure is no exception in terms of describing sex and sexual issues broadly as in many other naturalistic works. Due to his description of these subject matters, Hardy was seen as a counterpart of other great novelists of that time, for example Zola, Tolstoy or Flaubert. All of his major characters have a problematic

sexual life. The deep passions for sexual love are of Hardy's concern and are many times involved in *Jude*.

As Baker states, Hardy pleaded for the sincerity and frankness for religious and sexual questions in novel writing, because these topics were described only in a timid and conventional way in the Victorian age. The manner of frankness in which Hardy dealt with the duel between sexes was influenced by his knowledge of Ibsen and it resulted in the creation of an emancipated woman, Sue. (Baker, 76) In the following paragraphs, the main characters will be discussed from the point of view of their sexual problems, abnormalities and instincts.

Sue Bridehead is a woman of suppressed sexual needs. Her unsuccessful marriage to Richard Phillotson, a headmaster in Shaston and Jude's former village teacher, did not last for a long time and soon failed. The reason for this failure is Sue's sexual preferences, Phillotson being unattractive to her. Her jump out of a window after Phillotson entered her bedroom unexpectedly in the middle of a night is the most shocking proof of her distaste for him, but at the same time the most convincing feature of her disorder.

“There was a quick cry from the bed, and a quick movement. [...] Sue starting up half-awake, staring wildly, and springing out upon the floor on the side away from him, which was towards the window. [...] she had mounted upon the sill and leapt out. She disappeared in the darkness and he heard her fall below.” (Hardy, 1994, 270)

But being a woman of sudden turnarounds and ending as a bundle of nerves, Sue is found entering her again-husband Phillotson's bedroom, offering herself to him in the final pages of the novel, in spite of the incident with the window. Sue's neuroticism convinced her of Phillotson's right to have her. She persuaded herself of the necessity of them behaving as a married couple with everything expected. Sue insisted on fulfilling her wife's duties even though Phillotson refused to have her, when Sue revealed to him her aversion to his body and repugnance for their intimate moments. Knocking at her husband's bedroom door, Sue asks him to let her fulfill her wedding promise and become his wife in the most intimate way. Still she can't help herself and shortly after entering the room, her husband discovers her true feelings about the act. Sue trembles for a while but then commands herself to be acquiescent and prove her fidelity to her husband, whom she promised to be a good wife before the eyes of God.

“You still bear in mind what it means?’ ‘Yes. It is my duty!’ [...] lifting her bodily, kissed her. A quick look of aversion passed over her face, but clenching her teeth she uttered no cry.” (Hardy, 1994, 277)

On the other hand, Sue’s aversion to her real husband is compensated by her sexual life with Jude. Still, several times during their affairs, Sue feels strongly confused and does not really understand her deep feelings and disruptive states of mind in terms of her preferences for Jude. According to Walter Allen, Sue is aware of her ambiguity and sexual ambivalence and this helps her to survive. At the same time she can not understand her state:

“At first I did not love you, Jude; that I own. When I first knew you I merely wanted you to love me. I did not exactly flirt with you; but that inborn craving which undermines some women’s morals almost more than unbridled passion – the craving to attract and captivate, regardless of the injury it may do the man – was in me; and when I found I had caught you, I was frightened.” (Hardy, 1994, 422)

Her ambiguous behaviour is crowned by her rejection of sexual life with Jude after their little children died so suddenly and dramatically. Her nerves tighten up to the highest possible level: “I am a wretch, broken by my distractions.” (Hardy, 1994, 418) Sue thinks over her decision to live with Jude: “I don’t think I ought to be your wife – or as your wife – any longer.” (Hardy, 1994, 414)

Sue’s distractions after the death of her babies totally changed her points of view on life as a whole. She even seems to be considering living with Jude without being married as a sin against the God. This is a deep wound for Jude, not expecting the change in her directions: “And as I have often said, you have been the most ethereal, least sensual woman I ever knew to exist without inhuman sexlessness.” (Hardy, 1994, 412)

Penny Boumelha suggests that Sue can not decide what kind of a woman she should represent, whether she should behave as a peculiar reasonable woman, or if she could stay just a representative of her sex. (Boumelha, 439) For Sue this question is crucial, throughout the whole novel she struggles with these two viewpoints and she adapts her feelings to the concrete situations. Boumelha further adds that Jude and Sue are in a constant juxtaposition, Jude’s sexuality and Sue’s dominance of her intellectual ambitions changing unpredictably and immediately. (Boumelha, 442)

Jude himself is not sure whether he should rely on his sexual instincts or not. Jude's marriage with Arabella was caused by Jude's sexuality and his instincts which could not be overcome by his conscious processes of decision and intention. Their meeting below the picture of Samson and Delilah illustrates dominance of women's sexuality. Jude's sexual vulnerability brought him complications in his future life and cost him his goals and wishes.

After his first kiss with Sue, Jude suspects women of being the responsible ones for taking the men away from their virtues, such as study and religion. He even asks himself a question:

“Is it the artificial system of things, under which the normal sexual impulses are turned into the devilish domestic gins and springs to noose and hold back those who want to progress?” (Hardy, 1994, 259)

Even though he considers sexual impulses devilish, Jude let himself be overtaken by them. His passion for Sue is obvious from the first time Jude saw her at the Christian shop she was working in, his aunt being the one who warned him against meeting her but at the same time drawing Jude's attention to his relation, a possible friend of his.

Despite his awareness of their incompatibility from the point of view of their family relationship as well as their predetermination for an unsuccessful wedding (see chapter 2.2.1.), Jude can not prevent himself from loving Sue and seducing her at the same time. Watching Sue at her workplace or meeting her discretely at Sunday service in church, Jude did not dare to address her directly:

“He was inclined to follow her and reveal himself. But he was not quite ready; and, alas, ought he to do so with the kind of feeling that he was awakening in him? [...] He could not altogether be blind to the real nature of the magnetism.” (Hardy, 1994, 110)

Jude's first intention to make an acquaintance with a relation, to be familiar with her and make a friend in the cold unfriendly city of Christminster failed. After seeing her continually he became aware of his feelings for his cousin to be more than only friendship and affection for a relationship: “... he must not attempt intimate acquaintance with Sue Bridehead now that his interest in her had shown itself to be unmistakably of a sexual kind.” (Hardy, 1994, 116)

As their life story proceeds, their love is not stable and settled because of a sudden turn of events resulting in Sue's various disturbances, too. Therefore their departure can

not be accomplished without a deep misunderstanding on the side of Jude and a sorrowful explanation on the side of Sue. Jude accused Sue of lesser love given to him then she received back: “But Sue – my wife as you are! You have never loved me as I love you – never – never! Yours is not a passionate heart – your heart does not burn in a flame!” (Hardy, 1994, 422) They continued in arguing about their departure, which led to Jude accusing himself of spoiling their love by letting Sue leave her husband and live together with Jude: “Perhaps - perhaps I spoilt one of the highest and purest love ever existed between man and woman!” (Hardy, 1994, 423-4)

Sue replies by another accusation, this time of herself, explaining why she accepted Jude’s love when she had captured him:

“I couldn’t bear to let you go – possibly to Arabella again – and so I got to love you, Jude. But you see, however fondly it ended, it began in the selfish and cruel wish to make your heart ache for me without letting mine ache for you.” (Hardy, 1994, 422)

Sue’s confession of her selfishness and cruelty is the result of her sense of guilt for ruining Jude’s life because of her wrong behaviour, inconvenient for a young, married woman.

Arabella, Jude’s first wife and a woman of strong sexual lust, is another example of Hardy depicting sexual instincts with no prejudices and adornment. Throughout the whole novel, the reader can monitor her struggle for a man, because she needs him both sexually and for looking respectable. Her animality is illustrated by throwing a boar pizzle at Jude when they have met for the first time. Neither being secured for the future in the case of money is not of low importance for her. This comes to a top when Arabella, with all her unscrupulousness, having not buried her second-again-husband yet, Jude, and is already seeking another man victim, her possible new husband to supply her sex, food and money.

Zola’s interpretation of these issues goes into a far more detailed conception. His characters are obsessed with sex and let their passion rule themselves naturally and very often immediately. Therefore a reader can witness sex deprived of any kind of romantics, a sexual act itself being viewed as a fulfillment of physical needs. In Zola’s interpretation, sex becomes an act of consumption, or to be more naturalistic, of eating. People’s hunger for sex, food or money seems to be the same.

People tend to steal away seconds to let their passion spring from inside of them and let them satisfy their basic need. And it is this moment which Zola considers important for proving people to be descendants of animals and sharing some common features with them. In terms of this love or sex is seen only as a means of creating new lives, in *Germinal* called 'making babies': "the putters came and conceived their first babies" (Zola, 2004, 126) It is lowered to an animal instinct.

For Zola sex or even sexual violence is something deeply hidden in people's souls, it is a passion which can consume them. Concerning violence, men are used to taking what belongs to them in their opinion. Being the stronger ones they are predetermined to treat women like a means of their satisfaction, to be more precise as a means for satisfying their libido. Unconcerned by women's lack of interest, protests or resistance, men insist on their right to have their moment of joy every time they want. Although Catherine did not feel for it, Chaval led her to the ruins of the old pit, Réquillart, where she pleaded him to let her go: "No, no, I don't want to! I've told you, I'm too young..." (Zola, 2004, 131) At the same time she is aware that "nothing will halt the man's all-conquering advance." (Zola, 2004, 131) Because Chaval did not intend to let her go, he "grabbed her firmly [...] She fell back on to the coils of old rope and ceased to resist, submitting herself to the male even though she was not ready for him." (Zola, 2004, 131)

Further on men justified their behaviour by perceiving women's refusals as a foreplay to a following act: "if girls say no, it's only because they like a spot of a rough treatment first." (Zola, 2004, 129) A few pages earlier Zola proves this objection, finding La Maheude struggling "playfully to escape, wriggling her waist and bust in vain." (Zola, 2004, 118) From the naturalistic point of view this is the case when a man is perceived as a close relative to an animal, taking what he wants for granted. On top of that men are viewed as the lords of creation who make their profit from their strength which any woman can resist.

Villages in the region of Lille built by mining companies especially for miners were crowded by miners and their families and houses were close to each other, organized into quartets with one common well and one back garden. The absolute lack of any privacy leads people from the mining village Two hundred and forty to share their private acts with a lot of other people.

The resignation of people for any kind of privacy culminated in taking every opportunity to satisfy their needs anywhere possible. Similarly to the quotation above, even in their own houses people were not ashamed of having sex in front of the other members of family, the teenagers trying to hide at a nearby shed often, so their parents could not see them doing unapproved things. The following passage illustrates how with no embarrassment they accepted the situation. Catherine simply waits until her parents are finished with their love making, evidently hearing them, “Is it all right to come down?” (Zola, 2004, 119) and the youngest one, Estelle, is just turned from her parents not looking at them directly, “And with Estelle sitting there looking at us! Wait, till I turn her round!” (Zola, 2004, 119) The children then tried to imitate their parents and they “would experiment at the love they heard and saw going on at home behind partition walls or through cracks in the door.” (Zola, 2004, 125) For miners and their wives, consuming sex is as natural as having a drink on Saturday evening and children are just innocently pretending to play mother and father, starting their sexual lives much earlier than they should.

The young miners and their girls did not have many places where they could have their first sexual experience. Therefore they hid behind their parents’ houses, went to the abandoned pit where “they made themselves as comfortable as they could, cheek by jowl and yet oblivious to their neighbours” (Zola, 2004, 126) or in the nearby cornfield in the summer:

“he was always tripping over some couple hidden in the grass. Even worse, whenever he wanted to fetch some wood to cook his soup [...], there all the girls of Montsou would be, popping their pretty little noses up out of the grass, and he had to be careful where he trod so as not to step on any of the legs stretched out across the path.” (Zola, 2004, 127)

The mine was not an exception, a lot of dark corners could provide attractive places where no one else could see. Their age being low, parents often could not prevent their children from their premature start of sexual life. This is also the case of La Moquette, a stout teenage girl, notorious for her experience:

“From the age of ten La Moquette had been having sex in every corner of the ruins, not, like Lydie, as a timid and unripe little urchin-child, but as a girl who had filled out and was ready for boys with beards.” (Zola, 2004, 127)

La Moquette is a girl of lust who can satisfy almost every man in her neighbourhood and the mine is another good opportunity for her, her reputation being so bad that nothing can make it worse: “she was quite capable of having both pit-boys at once.” (Zola, 2004, 44) The miners as well as little children knew where to find her in case of her absence at her working place: “I expect one of ‘em’s having it off with La Moquette” (Zola, 2004, 44)

If sex is considered an act of consumption by Zola, he even gives more sharp labels not compatible with people’s morality at the end of the nineteenth century. In the top levels of miners’ society this most intimate relationship can serve as currency or a means for personal entertainment and chasing away boredom of wealthy bourgeoisie ladies.

Madamme Hennebau, the wife of the mine manager of the pit called Le Voreux, where all the main characters extract coal from, is bored with her husband’s work so she changes lovers often as they have been changing their place of living, now preferring the young nephew of her husband, Paul Négrel: “One evening, naturally, he ended up in her arms; [...] telling him that she was dead to love and simply wanted to be his friend.” (Zola, 2004, 205) At the village women mock at her husband: “The man looks like a cuckold!” (Zola, 2004, 110) referring to “... all the man she’s had, of course!... First, there’s the engineer...” (Zola, 2004, 110)

But not only the bourgeoisie think of sex as ‘having fun’ or ‘playtime’. More of Zola’s characters, miners, innkeepers and shopkeepers consider sex the only thing which can and improve their harsh living and spice or fulfill their empty or sexually unsatisfactory lives.

Maigrat, the shopkeeper of the biggest and best supplied shop in the village is used to colliers’ poverty and let them pay their shopping when they have their money or he simply takes the debts naturally: “When a miner needed more credit, he had only to send round his daughter or wife, no matter if they were pretty or plain, just as long as they were obliging.” (Zola, 2004, 92)

Out of money and having a debt of sixty francs to pay back to the shopkeeper, La Maheude begs him for two loaves of bread and several other items, being aware of having no money with her. Being reluctant to the shopkeeper’s lust, she felt: “embarrassed to be subjected to the pale gleam of his little eyes as they undressed her. It

made her angry.” Even though, after another struggle and begging so hard, La Maheude leaves the shop with all the necessary supplies but with an inevitable feeling that she can not let her daughter step into this shop again: “In fact it wasn’t herself he was after, it was Catherine, as La Maheude understood when he told her to send her daughter for the rest of the provisions.” (Zola, 2004, 98) This degradation of sex as means of payment lead to accepted prostitution of many women or their daughters, having no other possibility how to supply their family with food and coffee.

The widow Desire, who runs Jolly Fellow, a bar with an inn and a big dance hall, boasts all over the village with her extraordinary quantity of lovers she has and is capable of satisfy: “so full of energy that she had six lovers, one for each day of the week, she used to say, and all six of them at once on Sunday.” (Zola, 2004, 159)

Collier men and probably women too, found sex to be the only thing being for providing a free and good way of entertaining themselves:

“moreover, as for all the comrades in the village, it was their ‘playtime’, [...] couldn’t a fellow enjoy his one good moment in a day, what he called ‘having his pudding’ – and a pudding that didn’t cost anything!” (Zola, 2004, 118)

This approach, common to every miner in a community, helps them survive the toil and harshness of their profession. An insufficient amount of money prevents them from having their entertainment in bars or public houses, so the men found their entertainment straightly enough at home.

But their women were often unsatisfied with their home affairs and therefore looked for amusement somewhere else. Both La Pieronne and La Levaque, neighbours of La Maheude, were suspected of having lovers and became a subject of usual village gossip, the first one dating a pit engineer, Négrel, the latter cheating on her husband with a lodger accommodated in their house. La Maheude criticizes both of them, reflecting that: “having a lodger can be a great advantage. Except that you should never sleep with them.” (Zola, 2004, 102) and reducing La Pieronne’s happiness claiming that: “Anyone can be spick and span if they’ve got lovers who earn three thousands francs...” (Zola, 2004, 107)

As it can be apparent from the quotation above, Zola described the sexual act as an animal instinct and deprived it of any possible romanticism or poetic point of view. To summarize it briefly, the words of Roger Pearson seem to fit enough:

“Love is not love but sex; and sex is not making love but screwing, raping, having it off, in the fields, on the roof of a shed, behind the spoil-heap where all the rubble from the mine is piled.” (Pearson, xxi)

Apart from sex being considered an animal instinct and humiliated by the cruel situation people lived in, love also appears in its purest form in *Germinal*. Maheu and La Maheude still love each other deeply and passionately and living without the other would be a catastrophe for the one who survives. Thus we can find La Maheude grieving and screaming in agony in suspicion of her husband’s death which did not prove to be true. They still have a strong affection for each other as well as for their children, whom they might consider ungrateful and only another mouths to feed, but to whom they are devoted to deeply.

5.3.1. Conclusion

To compare the concept of love as presented by Zola and Hardy, according to Walter Allen behind Hardy’s depiction of sex we can find a passion and ballad with an ending of uncomfortably but still with a little bit of romantics comprised in its lines. (Allen, 244) Zola’s point of view is that of “a weed-infested dump upon which to sow the seed of yet more wasted, worthless lives.” (Pearson, xxi) Even though sex is the most important, we can find a kind of love in Zola’s work. It is the love of parents for their children and the affection Etienne feels for Catherine at the beginning.

While Hardy concentrates on the tension Jude has to resist because of difference between the two women who accompany him in his life, Zola’s concept is more focused on animal instincts people inherited from their predecessors. Jude is caught between Arabella, a female whose animosity attracts him, because “every now and then he needs a bit of wallowing in sex” (Howe, 400) and Sue, whose spirituality gives him a friend of with whom he can share his feelings and ideas, but who is not so spontaneous in terms of her basic needs and instincts, which Jude tries to tolerate but sometimes is desperate about. Etienne ends up in the arms of La Moquette, who is notoriously famous for her “open heart” for every man, because he is lacking sex a basic need.

Apart from these differences of concept of sex issue stated in previous paragraphs, their approaches to this subject matter can be considered very close to each other. Both Zola and Hardy spoke about sexual acts in broad and open manner which provoke their contemporaries. It was their aim to spoke more frankly and Hardy himself considered

this frankness important because he refused the taboos rooted in a Victorian society. For both writers sex is something which must be talked about and should not be overlooked.

The difference can be found in the language and frankness with which they dealt with the topic in their works. In comparison with Zola, Hardy stays still rather moderate in terms of choice of language and means of stylistics. Zola's language is free from any diminutives and serves its reader the most spontaneous picture of this intimacy without any adornment or prejudices. Zola's choice of words is connected to his effort to be objective which results in rude or shocking manner of his novel. Lucien White refers to another of Zola's novels in which the author used certain words, *ventre* and *cuisses* for example, forty five respectively forty eight times. This helped to emphasize the eroticism of the atmosphere. (White, 363) Even a reader of current times may be still overwhelmed by the frankness Zola serves him, preferring the idea of primary animality of sex and leaving love as a psychological aspect on a second row behind primary animal instinct. Nothing could stay hidden, no hypocrisy was to be allowed or tolerated. (White, 371)

For a modern reader Hardy is easily acceptable because the question of divorce and non-marital relationships became a part of social relations many years ago. Also Hardy's choice of words is not that shocking and biased, in his work it is not possible to feel such distance from human feelings, in terms of this his language is more comforting and less disturbing in connection to the whole story even though the situation is purely tragic.

5.4. Social environment, Taine's "le moment et la milieu"

As a Naturalist Hardy let society, or in other words the environment and the situation, influence his characters' lives importantly. Both Jude and Sue were strongly affected by rejection by the society surrounding them, the pair of lovers being unacceptable from the moral point of view of passers by. Looking for a place to live happily and with no disturbances because of their unmarried status, they failed to be successful. People commenting on their situation, old women gossiping around the corner about their son Father time being not theirs because of his age, these all brought

problems into already problematic coexistence between Sue, changing her opinions and being of weak nerves, and Jude, still obsessed with Christminster and education.

Months before their acquaintance Jude felt the rejection of his person from possible education at Christminster colleges, even though he studied maybe harder than other undergraduates. But having no money or power relatives and titles around his name, he is not welcomed to enter the colleges. Jude even receives this rejection formally, after asking one of the academic workers for help:

“judging from your description of yourself as a working-man, I venture to think that you will have a much better chance of success in life by remaining in your own sphere and sticking to your trade than by adopting any other course.” (Hardy, 1994, 140)

This rough expression of opinion affected Jude’s chance to obtain a degree at university and after an unlucky marriage with Arabella, it became a second great hit for his self-confidence. Being accepted and allowed to study at colleges meant everything to Jude and such interference into his plans for a successful future affected him deeply. He felt like a social outcast who should accept his place in an order of society and should not interfere into business of wealthy or socially significant people. F.B Pinion calls it a struggle between a man and his rights and the society on the other side. (Pinion: 172)

Because of their marital status, which was not really common in these days, Sue and Jude became an interesting issue of village gossiping, old ladies being offended by their family situation considering it inconvenient and scandalous. All the rumours resulted into offending them in a church where they were restoring the Ten Commandments, comparing their work with, even indirectly, a legend of the shire. In that the workers were not religious:

“all saw that the Ten Commandments wez painted with “The Nots” left out. Decent people wouldn’t attend service for along time, and the Bishop had to be sent for to re-consecrate the church. [...] The visitors gave one more glance, as if to see whether Jude and Sue had left the Nots out likewise” (Hardy, 1994, 360)

After all the people departed, Sue expresses her disgust about their prejudices and misunderstanding for themselves. More than anything Sue is disappointed by their disrespect of other people’s decisions and sticking to habits of these days:

“I can’t bear that they, and everybody, should think people wicked because they may have chosen to live their own way! It is really these

opinions that make the best intentioned people reckless, and actually become immoral.” (Hardy, 1994, 360)

That was very exhausting and offensive for the couple and this hate and lack of respect caused other difficulties between them. To use words of F. Pinion again, social prejudices opposed the true love which did not have many chances to survive on condition that people will assess everybody according to their conventional code of behaviour. (Pinion: 172)

The tragedy of Sue and Jude is completed in Christminster which Jude is still obsessed about and where they decided to move because of the anonymity provided by a big city. Unfortunately it proves to be impossible to find any lodgings because of their social status, Sue and Jude having their own two little children, one more is to be expected and Little Father Time, Arabella and Jude's son being adopted by Sue. Nobody is willing to offer two rooms for a family which is not conventionally accepted, the parents unmarried with three children and one more on the way. Finally they managed to persuade a woman to let them stay for a one night in a very small room, being impossible to squeeze them all inside. This resulted in Jude's departure to search for a room in a nearby inn and Sue was left alone with the children feeling depressed by their situation, perceiving it as a injustice and malice of the people considering them social outcasts. Sue gets involved in a philosophical debate with Little Father Time, a child of Jude and Arabella's who behaves like a little adult which Sue accepted for a while and her speech was meant to be hold with an adult person not a child. Therefore they spoke about children coming to the world, Little Father Time accused his step mother of irresponsibility because of expecting another baby of theirs, claiming that if children cause so much trouble they should be killed directly before they start to walk around not to produce another trouble:

“O you don't care, you don't care!” he cried in a bitter reproach. ‘How ever could you, mother, be so wicked and cruel as this, when you needn't have done it till we was better off, and father well! To bring us all into more trouble! No room for us and father a-forced to go away [...] ‘Tis done o' purpose!’” (Hardy, 1994, 399)

After having breakfast with Jude in the inn he dwelt, they went back to the small room where the children's bodies were found dead, Little Father Time killed them all and left a note: “Done because we are too meny.” (Hardy, 1994, 401) This seems to be the most

naturalistic point of their tragedy, strongly affecting the reader's feelings. Hardy makes the society and also the overstrained nerves of Sue responsible for their difficult family situation which resulted in an immense tragedy of the lovers and their children. Because of the conventions strongly rooted in a society they simply could not be happy in the form of living they decided to accept. Only few hours before the tragic death of the children, Jude gave a short speech to a crowd of people awaiting a procession of new doctors being entitled earlier this day:

“I perceive there is something wrong somewhere in our social formulas: what it is can only be discovered by men or women with greater insight than mine,-if, indeed, they ever discover it- at least in our time.” (Hardy, 1994, 390)

This statement by Jude may be perceived as an accusation of society spoiling his and his family's lives. The environment they all lived in was unwilling to accept them and the system of social classes did not allow them to find a better life for them. Therefore the environment and situation could be viewed by Naturalists as shaping factors in the development of people's lives.

Zola proved himself to be a perfect commentator on the social background of his characters' professions. He intended to produce a sociological study of a family of his age, the second empire. Warning claims that Zola's interest was that of a detailed description of a certain epoch of French history, based on the family of that time. Thus he combined a historical condition with a genotype from the family of Rougon-Macquart, he connected race and the moment. (Warning, 708) As Naturalists believed and according to *Taine's philosophy*, the environment was one of the shaping factors of peoples' lives. Therefore Zola documented the environment, where characters from *Germinal* live, in every possible detail. Descriptions of luxurious furnishing in bourgeoisie's lodgings contrast sharply with colliers' village and the interiors of their houses infected by poverty:

“Apart from the varnished pine dresser, the furniture consisted of a table and chairs, also in pine. Stuck to the walls were a number of garish prints, portraits of the Emperor and Empress as provided by the Company, as well as various soldiers and saints, heavily daubed with gold, which all looked crude and out of place in the bright bareness of the room.” (Zola, 2004, 23)

The surroundings around village Two hundred and forty and the pit itself help a reader to imagine conditions in which miners share lives with their families and fellow workers. Zola particularly studied the colliers' work and the equipment and the interior of a pit:

“..he watched the cages come and go, deafened by the rumble of the coal tubs. Next to the shaft was a signal, a heavy hammer on a leer attached to a rope which, when pulled from bellow, caused the hammer to fall on a block. Once to stop, twice to descend, three times to come up: it never stopped, great cudgel-blows that could be heard above the din, accompanied by the bright ring of a bell.” (Zola, 2004, 27)

Zola determined the environment as one of the factors changing people's lives and characters. Miners, who were simply living, if possible, their peaceful and happy lives in their numerous families generation after generation, were not naturally warlike. Until the owners decided to lower their wages, colliers did not disturb the work in the pits. But because of their suffering from terrible poverty and starvation, they entered a strike for a pay rise. They were influenced by their harsh living conditions and their patience could not last for ever. Their critical situation forced them to take unusual measures. In their eyes the strike was not anything done for getting something luxurious, they did not fight for extra conditions or money. The miners just required money sufficient enough to cover food expenses for their families.

To understand the complex interpretation of Zola's story it is necessary to outline the economic situation of those days. As Pearson claims, the situation in 1860 France was not easy, too much money has been invested in industry, too much hope was inserted into earning twice a sum invested. But the crisis of industry changed everything and investors were not prepared for a recession, which came from the USA which stopped importing French coal and iron. Who was to blame? Definitely the poor people, workers from factories or colliers from pits. Companies were forced to economize and their first logical step was cutting down the wages of their workers. (Pearson: xx) Because Zola wanted to draw a real picture of miners' situation he even visited a strike at Anzin in 1884, where he stayed for one week, making elaborated notes of events and of miners' lives. For him this was later the main source for his work. He also studied the strikes of La Ricamarie, 1869 and Aubin, 1869 where thirteen respectively fourteen miners were shot dead during the strike. (Pearson: xix)

To understand the behaviour of miners and their anger is therefore connected with their hopeless situation and terrible living conditions. Several weeks of striking exhausted their provisional fund and food supplies had run out. Miners, their wives and their children as well were uptight with tensions and were easy to provoke to some misbehaviour. Their instincts commanded them to survive and therefore they became a group of uncontrolled animals struggling for food and revenge. Considering them peaceful people at the beginning of the novel, a reader can be shocked by the sudden change miners underwent, but they had no choice, being pushed to their state of mind by outer world and its system. The wilderness, unpredictability and uncontrollable temper were woken up by an animal inside of all the miners, fighting for its life due to consequences of the unsatisfying living conditions. Their characters were changing slowly but constantly as well as their anger had been growing. Originally satisfied with their place in a society once they were not paid sufficiently miners acquired habits of revolutionaries.

Étienne Lantier himself could not be considered anybody else than another worker at the beginning of the story. The exploitation of miners by the company and injustice in terms of managing colliers' civil rights impelled him to consider possibilities of resistance against this unsustainable state. He views his role as a mission towards the working society which is not educated and therefore is not able to defend itself against organized and powerful companies or shareholders. Studying every possible source of anarchistic, nihilistic or socialist ideas his conversion to socialism and sympathy for revolution began. Believing deeply in his ideals Lantier does not concede failure of their quest. Without entering this particular mining village where he coincidentally and luckily gained work as a miner and where he met other people infected by socialist ideas, he would maybe never have been interested in a change of world order and would not get involved. The circumstances and the environment are of a vital importance for naturalistic writers and these form their characters significantly.

In terms of their bad living conditions, such as a lack of privacy or their poverty, people in mining villages created their own moral codex ignoring a lot of moral habits of this time. Again in their situation they can not afford to share all the morals and norms of puritan society of the nineteenth century.

Therefore situations which could not be acceptable for 'la petite bourgeoisie' or studied citizens happened to be natural part of the paupers' lives and the environment did not let them consider these embarrassing or even indecent. Circumstances forced miners to accept the lowest level of behaviour, considering them according to the nineteenth century norms. According to Roger Pearson Zola "fully planned to depict moral monstrosities thrown up by turbulence of the contemporary world." (Pearson: xxx) Various examples of so called inadequate behaviour or changes in habits will be described in following paragraphs in terms of poverty, money, children, sex and society's reaction on unusual situations and its prejudices, these being responsible for a lot of suffering of poor people.

Higher society was not able to accept the miners as equal people. They mostly saw them as a source of work which brought to the bourgeoisie significant amount of money spent on eating selected delicacies and wearing luxurious dresses. On the other side of the barricade stood miners who had started to be aware of exploitation and evaluate critically their expenses made on unnecessary luxury: "That's some money those women are wearing. Worth more than them, at any rate!" (Zola, 2004, 110)

Prejudices of well paid managers, subordinates, engineers and other higher pit staff against colliers and their families influenced the latter strongly. Their unwillingness to help and share at least part of their immense wealth with those who are the source of it was caused by their opinions of miners, considering them worthless creatures controlled only by alcoholism and uncarefulness. This is apparent from Mr Grégoire's statement, the one of a shareholder of Montsou mine: "instead of putting a few sous to one side the way countryfolk do, the miners just drink and run up debts, so that in the end there's nothing left for them to feed their families." (Zola, 2004, 95) Mrs Grégoire, a decent woman of sleek manner, but still able to provide the poorest people at least old clothes, is even terrified by the number of Maheus' children, commenting on this situation as unwise without thinking about the reasons that led to such a big number of children, which is seven actually. The unwillingness to understand problems of their workers and living in their own world is perceived as the worst of all the defects of bourgeoisie's characters by Zola. The bourgeoisie's opinion was simple, the poor workers should just accept their place in the society and should not interfere into the world of the wealth and educated people. Begging for money La Maheude agrees with this opinion despite of

her own different ideas: “The wisest thing in the end [...] is to try and go about your business honestly and accept the place where the good Lord has put you.” (Zola, 2004, 97) M.Grégoire responded in a frank and approving manner: “With such sentiments as those [...] one can rise above misfortune.” (Zola, 2004, 97)

Apart from unwillingness to understand and withdrawnness from world’s problems, Zola attacked the hypocrisy and cruelty which the higher society showed to their associates and miners as well. When Mrs Hennebeau guides her guests, companion shareholders from Paris, around the mining village Two hundred and forty, she shows it as a place for happy living with everything needed and granted: “Really one could live here oneself it’s so charming.” (Zola, 2004, 108) Counting all the advantages of living in such a village, she impresses her guests so much they consider the village a wonder: “It’s Eldorado. A land of milk and honey!” (Zola, 2004, 108) Even though everybody visiting the poor cottage is familiar with an actual state of things, no one shares his real feelings with his or her companion. The poverty hanging in the air of a spick and span cottage is something not polite to discuss and the shareholders are not actually really interested in people’s difficulties. The only thing they are able to perceive is the imitated happiness and satisfaction with a family life when everybody can work in a mine. The easiest thing to do is to get rid of poverty when it is boring and tiring, going home, where comfortable furnishing and servants are ready to fulfill all the requirements, seems to be a convenient solution. Members of higher society did not wish to be disturbed with poverty longer than necessary.

Children working in a mine were usual in the nineteenth century society in spite of the Victorian concept of childhood, where children were seen as innocent creatures, born to be protected. In miners’ families boys and girls from eight or nine years were strong and old enough to do a very exhausting and dangerous job. The cult of innocence was only for the wealthy ones who could afford a potential source of money being unused. The naturalistic point of view is far more different from the Victorian one, the situation and living condition changing completely this idealistic vision of childhood. Children had to make money for themselves because hard living conditions made the miners and their wives look at their children as ungrateful creatures needed to be fed everyday and consuming most of their money then. Even Étienne, having no children yet, views so many children as an irresponsible act of foolishness:

“All this hardship! And all these girls, shattered with exhaustion but stupid enough come the evening to make babies for themselves, yet more flesh fit only for toil and starving.” (Zola, 2004, 128)

Having babies at an early age is seen as a disaster for a family's house financing. Leaving their parents meant supporting their own family instead of paying back the parents, as they saw it: “It was only the mothers who were cross when their sons started too early, because once the lad was married he stopped bringing money home to his family.” (Zola, 2004, 103) In their minds, children behave irresponsibly to their parents who took care of them for a long time, which should be paid back by the children:

“Zacharie should show us a bit of consideration, shouldn't he? He's cost us money after all, and it's time he paid some of it back before of us, I ask you, if our children all started working for other people straight away?” (Zola, 2004, 113)

The conditions and society changed completely the point of view parents have on their children. Forced by economic reasons, they did not perceive them as the little ones who need to be protected but as the ones who can help family budget. The love between parents and their children was postponed because of the harsh circumstances of their lives.

5. 4.1. Conclusion

Society and its formal criteria for evaluating its members was an issue of great significance for both Hardy and Zola. As F.B Pinion states, “Hardy was too much involved with his quarrel against society.” (Pinion: 54) Pinion further adds that criticism is the strongest particularly in *Jude the Obscure* (Pinion: 168) Both the writers criticized a lack of possibilities for ordinary people to penetrate the higher levels of society and rejection of the least happy ones by the ones placed higher in the social hierarchy was combined with hypocrisy of the latter. All the wealthy or more educated ones simply ignored the fact that everybody is equal and therefore should be provided the same opportunity. Recommendations of the gentry or academics to all the characters met in both novels were done in the most inconvenient manner, indicating that the only place suitable for them is in the lower branches of the society. Irving Howe mentions that snobbery was fixed in British society, some social classes being superior to the others. (Howe, 396) For the others education became a means of escaping their social misery,

believing that it could give them more promising opportunities and expectations for their lives. As Howe further continues, Jude struggles for his goals with promethean resistance to fatality (Howe, 397) but as any reader already knows, without any improvement of his life. Hardy criticized the impermeability of social classes and rigidity of the superior ones whose members resisted strongly to any changes they feared and which could harm them seriously. Therefore both Etienne and Jude are isolated in their social position, their effort to gain respect and obtain a position of certain respect and success in the society fails continuously. The impossibility to change the order or simply or promote to a higher level depresses the main heroes of the books and their belief in a better or fairer world dies away.

In Jude's case the tragedy is finished by the remarriage of him with Arabella and the remarriage of Sue with Phillotson, even though these marriages are doomed to be satisfactory. Criticism of marriage law and social conventions connected to it stands as another great topic of Hardy's novel. Ending in an unsatisfactory matrimony union is viewed as a retribution for sins of both Jude and Sue, but they accept the union with Arabella, respectively Phillotson, because it is conventionally accepted and expected. Love does not have a space in their world because they are unable to marry and living together brings them only malice, disrespect and rejection.

Depiction of environment and situation required hours and hours of studying. Both Zola and Hardy were obsessed with accuracy and depiction of every possible detail which could help to describe the atmosphere and would make the story more natural and believable. For Naturalists it was vital to persuade the reader about their truth, which means that environment and the situation are responsible for people's characters and development of their life stories. In their concept, a man is not ruled by his own will but is fully subordinated to the environment surrounding him, being only "a straw blown hither and yon by influences within and without." (White, 366)

Jude, Sue and Etienne are witnesses of changing world and as novel characters they are products of the changing situation. Because of new conditions set by outer reality they adapt to these and as characters of a novel they became a picture of social progress. Dreary conditions and clichés of nineteenth century society are responsible for Jude and Sue's as well as Etienne's tragedies and their lost of hopes, their dreams remained unfulfilled.

6. Conclusion

To conclude, the nineteenth century gave enough stimulus for Naturalism to appear. Philosophical studies were in progress and full of interesting ideas influencing intellectuals, such as writers or scientists. Philosophy of Taine formed and its terms “la race, le moment and la milieu” a base for another philosophical progress made by Auguste Comte and his Positivism. Comte’s focus on empiric observations based on perception of senses was inspiring for English philosopher J.S.Mill who further developed Comte’s ideas and both of them helped sociology to emerge as a new scientific discipline derived from philosophy.

From the field of study of natural sciences, Doctor Claude Bernard’s *Introduction a l’etude de la medecin experimental*, (Introduction to the Scientific Study of Medecine) and *Theory of heredity* created by Prosper Luceas can be perceived very important shaping factors of French Naturalism. But the theory of evolution called *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* and published by Sir Charles Darwin in 1859 proved to be the most influential one from the new scientific inventions. Together with Positivism and almost born sociology it gave a base for a birth of Social Darwinism, which can be found in naturalistic works of that time period and which was used by authors to prove the impermeability of social classes.

Characteristic features of Naturalism are the effort to be objective, usage of analytical approach, psychoanalysis of novels’ characters, showing humans as descendants of animals pointing at their instincts and deep passions and the influence of environment of circumstances and living condition on people’s lives. Concerning the form and subject matter, Naturalists did not bring anything specifically new into the narrative structure. Their narration sometimes contains long passages of characters’ psychoanalytic descriptions, which can slow the action. The story seems to lack dynamics and the characters seem to be passive in their life, simply waiting for their future fate. Moreover, they are persuaded that it is not possible to influence their future life because of the environment and circumstances, which are given for them. The subject matter is enriched for situations from lower classes, new characters appear from environment which was not described so far.

Analysis of the main characters is made in a detailed way in both novels. Both Hardy and Zola are concentrated on their characters and their goal is to depict their heroes and heroines in order to explain his or her behaviour. The details help the reader to understand the core of the main characters' problems and difficulties, which are often caused by their uneasy temperament. Women heroines are very similar to each other in both novels, Sue and Catherine are in difficult situation and are not able to solve it themselves but they waited to the circumstances to do it instead of them. Catherine is weak in her nerves but she is not as neurotic as Sue Bridehead proves to be. While Sue ends as a nervous wreck but fulfilling her social and conventionally expected duty, Catherine dies tragically, but resigned to her situation. Both these women characters have the same function and are shown as objects subordinate to the situation and circumstances from naturalistic point of view. In each of the book, Sue and Catherine have their counterparts, Arabella respectively La Moquette. These women are primarily females attracting men's interest and benefiting from their favor. Concerning main male characters Jude and Etienne, they both suffer in the society they are forced to live in, their ambition highly exceeding the usual expectations of their social class. Both are young intellectuals misunderstood by their fellow workers or friends. Their will is shaken by the circumstances and they are unable, at least for a while, to control their emotions.

Impact of sciences is clearly apparent in both *Jude the Obscure* and *germinal*. Bt the extent the authors approached concrete items of scientific items defined by Zola in his own *Le Roman Experimental* is different. Hardy is not so deeply affected by the medical experimental method, he is more influenced by English philosopher J.S.Mill and Herbert Spencer who worked with Darwin's *Theory*. Hardy's novel contains allusions on heredity but these are not supported by any evidence, the terms 'blood and flesh' refer more to Hardy's belief in supernatural forces that rules the Universe. Zola's approach is more devoted to his own principles of Naturalism. Whole Rougon Macquart saga function as an evidence of genetic determinism, the genealogic tree showing the diseases and insanity being transferred from one family member to another. His connections between people and animals are made throughout whole novel and are very persuasive.

Considering the scientific approach, objectivity is the problematic point in both novels. Both Zola and Hardy present only one truth, different opinions are not given any space to be justified. Therefore the novels seem rather schematic, Naturalism does not provide any space for uncertain objections. Everything is clearly given by authors who break their own rules. The choice of situations or words is made in order to appeal to the reader and to persuade him about the truth the writer presents in his novel

Circumstances and environment are responsible for characters' difficulties and their unhappy life. Their will and ambitions are broken either by social conventions or by circumstances their situation led them to. Both authors use the same means for depicting the influence of environment and circumstances. The society is the main influencing factor. Due to impermeability of social classes the heroes of the two novels are not allowed to lead better life. The fittest survives and this motto can be applied either on individuals or on the social classes, according to rules of Social Darwinism.

Depiction of sex and love depends on author's approach to some scientific items. For Zola sex is just an animal instinct or a pleasure. His choice of words and situations prove the premise that Zola degraded sex to an animal level, which helps him to prove his theory about humans as animals' descendants. Hardy's approach is based on similar premise, sexuality being considered as a problematic part of humans which overcome their intellectual part and often lead to ruin of the people. Even though Zola's stylistic means are sharper, it is possible to state that their approach to this is very close.

Naturalism was born in France and apart from the United States did not reach high level of popularity among writers and readers as well. Its founder, Zola, gave it clear frame and stated its features as well as its aims. These were not fulfilled because of impossibility to join the science and imaginative literature together, objectivity being the problematic factor. Naturalism influenced many other national literatures and even though all the principles of Naturalism were not often applied, it shaped many significant works, either novels or dramas. This was the case of Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*. This work is definitely naturalistic but it does not copy Zola's structure and does not fulfill his requirements as well. It is a special piece of art, an immense tragedy of people and their ambitions. This is the common feature of both books, *Germinal* and *Jude the Obscure* just outlined the problems of the society emerging at the end of the nineteenth century.

7. Resumé

Devatenácté století bylo bohaté na změny ve společnosti, politice i vědě. Objevy v oblasti věd přírodních i humanitních změnili život celé populaci a ovlivnily všechny lidské činnosti, umění proto nemohlo být výjimkou. Naturalismus jako literární směr se poprvé objevil ve Francii ve druhé třetině devatenáctého století a může být považován za produkt své doby. Situace ve společnosti se v této době rychle měnila, život běžných lidí byl ovlivněn ponejvíce průmyslovou revolucí, která přinesla kromě mnoha pozitivních momentů i negativní jevy, jako například rychle rostoucí a špinavá města či vesnice, kde žili chudí dělníci a kde nebyl dostatek jídla, lékařské práce a ani práce těchto námezdních dělníků nebyla poctivě ohodnocena. Tato situace působila na mnohé intelektuály, spisovatele nevyjímaje.

Filosofové a vědci byli na konci 19. století velmi produktivní, filosofie Hippolyta Tainea a Positivismus Augusta Comtea ve Francii a teorie J.S.Milla v Anglii hluboce ovlivňovaly názory spisovatelů této doby. Navíc výsledky na poli medicíny a přírodních věd se staly dalším výrazným faktorem, který ovlivnil vznik nového literárního směru. Jde především o Evoluční teorii druhů Charlese Darwina, poprvé publikována v roce 1865, a vědecké práce francouzských vědců doktora Prospera Lucase, který se zabýval teorií dědičnosti a doktora Clauda Bernarda, jenž publikoval Úvod do experimentálního studia medicíny. Všechny tyto vědecké práce dovedly Emila Zolu k přesvědčení, že i psaní románu lze pojmout jako vědeckou práci, ve které bude spisovatel uplatňovat postupy charakteristické pro přírodní vědy. Cílem Zolova naturalistického románu je tedy přenést vědecké postupy na pole literatury a dokázat že i imaginativní román lze psát vědecky a objektivně. Zola dokonce používal slovo vědec jako náhradu za spisovatele, neboť se chtěl přiblížit vědeckému postupu svých „kolegů“.

Ve vztahu k vědeckým tématům byla pro naturalisty nejdůležitější psychologická analýza hlavních postav románů, dědičnost a Darwinova Evoluční teorie druhů, podle které viděli naturalisté člověka jako vývojového následovníka zvířat, což s sebou přinášelo naturalistický důraz na základní, hluboce ukryté instinkty, kterými byla podle naturalistů dokazována vývojová spřízněnost člověka a jeho zvířecích předchůdců.

V literárních textech se naturalismus projevil ponejvíce strnulostí děje a pasivitou svých hlavních hrdinů a hrdinek. Postup vyprávění naturalisté v podstatě nezměnili,

nicméně časté zařazování popisů psychického stavu hlavních postav děj zpomalovalo a postrádá, až na výjimky, výraznější akci. Výběr témat se však posunul výrazně kupředu. Naturalisté se začali zabývat i lidmi z okraje společnosti a životem, který vedly nejenom obyčejní lidé, ale i alkoholici, vrazi, prostitutky a podobné postavy. Naturalisté si všímali prostředí, ve kterém se takovéto postavy pohybovali a přisuzovali mu velký vliv na chování a jednání postav svých románů.

Psychologická analýza postav byla v konkrétních dílech Emila Zola *Germinal* a Thomase Hardyho *Jude the Obscure* velmi detailně propracovaná. Důraz na detail byl charakteristický pro oba výše zmíněné spisovatele, jejich umění může být v tomto ohledu považované za mistrovské. Čtenář je vtažen do vnitřních pocitů postav, aby mohl pochopit všechny obtíže a nesnáze, do kterých se postavy během děje románů dostávají, neboť jsou to mnohdy právě jejich charakterové vlastnosti, které negativně ovlivnily jejich další osud.

Ženské postavy obou románů, Sue Bridehead resp. Catherine, jsou nervově labilní osoby, které nejsou schopny činit vědomě důležitá rozhodnutí a odkládají je tak do té doby, než jsou tato rozhodnutí učiněna situací či okolnostmi za ně, mnohdy s mnohem horším až tragickým důsledkem. Obě tyto ženské hrdinky plní ve svých románech stejnou úlohu, ukazují, jak situace, prostředí a okolnosti ovlivňují lidský život tak, že člověk nemá příliš šancí jej pozitivně ovlivnit. Jako protipól jsou těmto hrdinkám postaveny Arabella Donn, resp. La Moquette, které neskrývají bystrý intelekt, ale pouze živočišnost, která jim pomáhá přitáhnout k sobě mužské protějšky, i když pouze dočasně.

Mužské postavy, Jude a Etienne, jsou ambiciózní intelektuálové, jedni z mála kteří pocházejí z pracující vrstvy obyvatel. Jejich ambice jsou však utlumeny nemožností proniknout do vyšší sociální třídy, kde by mohli dále pracovat na svém vzdělání, neboť u pracujících lidí se toto v devatenáctém století příliš neočekávalo. Obě dvě výše zmíněné postavy bojují se svou vůlí, která je mnohokrát překonávána instinkty a dědičností. V obou případech, Judy i Etienna, se jedná o alkoholismus a sexualitu, které jim často brání v naplnění jejich cílů. Etienne je navíc charismatický člověk, který přitahuje pozornost svým řečnickým uměním a zájmem o zlepšení situace horníků.

Oba autoři zapojili do svých románů velké množství dalších postav, jejichž charaktery jsou mnohdy i přes jejich malou nebo krátkodobou roli v celkovém ději

detailně prokreslené. Mezi takové lze počítat rodiče Catherine, jejího milence Chaval, manžela Sue, Richarda Phillotsona a nevlastního syna Jude a Sue, pojmenovaného staroušek čas pro jeho hlubokou a filosofickou povahu. Všechny tyto detailní popisy postav mají za úkol přiblížit motivy jednání jednotlivých postav a zdůvodnění jejich potíží v životě.

Snaha přiblížit se vědeckému stylu i v imaginativní literatuře vedla naturalisty k častému používání odkazů na nové poznatky devatenáctého století. Dědičnost je důležitá nejen pro Zolu ale i pro Hardyho. Zola ve svém dvaceti románovém díle *Les Rougon-Macquart* přímo odkazuje na genealogický strom, na kterém dokazuje, jak se nemoci, sklony k alkoholismu či vraždění a šílenství přenášejí z jednoho člena rodiny na druhého. Jeho „Historie jedné rodiny za druhého císařství“ má za úkol dokázat postupnou degradaci této rodiny, stejně jako degradaci druhého císařství, které podle něj spěje ke zkáze. Oproti tomu jsou Hardyho narážky na dědictví krve vnímány spíše jako neurčitý pokus od použití teorie dědičnosti, ale spíše je patrný Hardyho zájem o nadpřirozeno, které řídí celý náš svět.

Další vědeckým aspektem přeneseným na pole literatury je Darwinova Evoluční teorie. Hluboko ukryté instinkty, které byly ve všech postavách vyvolávány v průběhu děje obou románů, byly pro spisovatele důkazem že člověk je ve své podstatě stále zvířetem. Podle Zoly šlo o otázku učení se dalším věcem, pro to se lidé od zvířat odlišují. Na druhou stranu ale Zola tvrdil, že nejdůležitější faktorem nakonec vždy bude situace a okolnosti, ve kterých se vše děje.

Co se týká objektivity, ta byla vysněným cílem naturalistických spisovatelů a právě kvůli ní se pokoušeli naturalisté uplatňovat vědecké postupy.. ukázalo se však, že není zcela možné aplikovat vše z vědy na literaturu. Objektivita Hardyho i Zoly není v jejich dílech patrná, vzhledem k účelovému výběru příkladů a postav či situací ani nebylo možné jí dosáhnout. Největším prohřeškem proti objektivitě díla je však prezentace pouze jednoho názoru a jeho obhajování, zatímco názoru jinému nebyl na obhajobu ani poskytnut prostor. Naturalismus sám neumožňuje prezentovat dvě pravdy, neboli dva úhly pohledu a proto se jeví mnohé naturalistické romány jako schematické a situace uměle podstrčené hlavním hrdinům.

Zvláštní podkapitolu tvoří vztah naturalistů k sexualitě a sexu samotnému. V Zolových dílech, a *Germinal* není výjimkou, je sex zobrazován bez jakékoliv

romantiky, jako prostý instinkt, který je třeba naplnit a uspokojit. Zola degradoval lidskou sexualitu na úroveň zvířat, je to tedy zároveň jeho pokus o příspěvek k Evoluční teorii, neboť právě na tomto příkladu dokazuje závislost lidského vývoje na zvířatech. Sexualita některých Zolových hrdinů, Chaval, La Moquette a částečně i Etienne, je zároveň jejich slabou stránkou, neboť jim jako základní instinkt překonává vůli a znehodnocuje další ambice. Hardyho přístup je v zásadě stejný, pouze volí mírnější jazykové prostředky a i když je sexuální stránka jeho postav výrazná, není v převaze a stále bojuje o převahu nad vůlí a intelektem, jejichž pozice je velmi silná.

Posledním výrazným prvkem přítomným v dílech naturalistů, je vliv prostředí a okolností na děj a chování postav. Jak už bylo výše uvedeno, nepropustnost jednotlivých sociálních vrstev vedla k zničení ambic mnoha naturalistických hrdinů, mnohým z nich dokonce "dopomohla" k velmi tragickému osudu. Jako příklad lze uvést smrt dětí Sue a Judy a posléze i Judy samotného nebo smrt Catherine a jejího otce. S pomocí sociálního darwinismu se jak Zola tak Hardy snažili ve svých dílech poukázat na problémy, které ve společnosti koncem devatenáctého století převládaly. Silnější vítězí a toto tvrzení lze podle obou autorů aplikovat jak na jedince tak na celé sociální třídy.

I přesto že se naturalismus zrodil ve Francii, dokázal ovlivnit řadu jiných národních literatur. Uplatňování naturalistických principů se pak přizpůsobovalo představám a potřebám jednotlivých autorů a to je i případ Thomase Hardyho. Největší rezerva je z pohledu naturalistické doktríny ukryta v objektivitě díla, nicméně s touto se nedokázal vyrovnat stoprocentně ani Zola, jako zakladatel celého směru. Ukázalo se, že spojení imaginativní literatury a vědy nebude možné a už vůbec ne přínosné. Hardy dále neaplikuje důsledně všechny Zolou popsané znaky naturalismu, nicméně jeho tvorba je jím ovlivněna a může být považována, alespoň některá díla, za naturalistickou. Z obou románů srovnávaných v této práci je však patrné, že příběhy lidí v nich zachycené jsou především lidskou tragédií, jejíž rozsah vysoko přesahuje rámec naturalismu jako literárního směru i se všemi jeho pravidly a charakteristickými znaky. Tento prvek dokazuje, že ve společnosti jsou mnohé zakotvené konvence překážkou jejího vlastního rozvoje a že pokud bude chtít lidstvo posunout svou civilizaci ku předu, bude muset tyto stereotypy změnit. V devatenáctém století nemohl nikdo tušit, jak přesně se jednou některé postřehy Thomase Hardyho i Emila Zoly budou zdát.

8. Bibliography

Printed amterials

ALLEN, Walter. 1954. *The English Novel*. Harmonswordth: Penguin books Ltd.

AUDI, Robert (ed). 1996. *The Cambridge History of Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-48328-X

BAKER, Ernest A. 1966. *The history of the English Novel*. Vol. IX., The Day before Yesterday. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc.

BOUMELHA, Penny. A Double Tragedy. In HARDY, Thomas. *Jude the Obscure: Norton critical edition*. New York: W.W Norton & Company, Inc. 1999. s. 438 – 447, ISBN 0-393-97278-X

CONTI, Fiorenzo. On Science and Literature: A Lesson from the Bernard-Zola Case. *Bioscience*, Sep2003, Vol. 53, issue 9. ISSN 00063568

FISHER, J.O. 1983. *Dějiny francouzské literatury 19. a 20. století*. Praha: Academia,

FRYČERA, Jaroslav. 2000. *Slovník francouzsky píšících spisovatelů*. Praha: Libri, ISBN: 80-7277-130-2

FURST, L.R., SKRINE, P.N. 1971. *Naturalism*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

GONCOURT, E., GONCOURT, J. 1994. *Gemniie Lacerteuxová*. Praha: Práce, 1976.

GUERARD, Albert, J. Hardy's Portrait of Sue Bridehead. In HARDY, Thomas. *Jude the Obscure: Norton critical edition*. New York: W.W Norton & Company, Inc. 1999. s. 424 – 427, ISBN 0-393-97278-X

HARDY, Thomas. 1994. *Jude the Obscure*. London: Penguin Group. ISBN 0-14-062060-5

HARVEY, P., HESELTINE, J (eds.) 1959. *The Oxford Companion to the French Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HORYNA, B. a kol. 1998. *Filosofický slovník*. 2.rozšířené vydání. Olomouc: Nakladatelství Olomouc, ISBN 807-182-064-4.

HOWE, Irving. A distinctively modern novel. In HARDY, Thomas. *Jude the Obscure: Norton critical edition*. New York: W.W Norton & Company, Inc. 1999. s. 393 – 404, ISBN 0-393-97278-X

LEHAN, Richard. Naturalism and the Realms of the Text: The problem Restated. *Studies in American Naturalism*. summer/winter 2006, Vol 1, issue ½. p15 – 29, 15p.

MCDOWEL, Frederick P. W. Imagery and Symbolism in Jude the Obscure. In HARDY, Thomas. *Jude the Obscure: Norton critical edition*. New York: W.W Norton & Company, Inc. 1999. s. 430 – 438, ISBN 0-393-97278-X

MIZENER, Arthur. *Jude the Obscure as a tragedy*. In HARDY, Thomas. *Jude the Obscure: Norton critical edition*. New York: W.W Norton & Company, Inc. 1999. s. 404 – 411, ISBN 0-393-97278-X

PINION, Frank B. 1968. *A Hardy Companion*. London: MacMillan and Co ltd.

PSICHARI, Henriette. 1964. *Anatomie d'un chef-d'oeuvre "Germinal"*. Mayenne: Mercure de France.

RATNER, Marc. A larger'slice of life': Re-assessing literary Naturalism. *College literatur.*, October 97, Vol. 24, issue 3, ISSN 00933139

WARNING, Rainer. Zola's Rougon/Macquart: Compensatory Images of a "Wild Ontology". *MLN*, Sept 98, Vol. 113, issue 4, p.705, 29p. ISSN 1126466

WHITE, Lucien W. Moral aspects of Zola's Naturalism judged by his contemporaries and by himself. *Modern Language Quarterly*, Dec62, Vol. 23, Issue 4, p360 - 372, 13p;

WEINBERG, Henry. *Zola's early critical concepts*. in *Modern Language Quarterly*; Jun67, Vol. 28 Issue 2, p207, 6p

ZATLOUKAL, Antonín. 1995. *Studie o francouzském románu*. Praha: Votobia, ISBN 80-7198-032-3, 360p.

ZOLA, Émile. *Germinal*. 2004. London: Penguin books, ISBN 0-140-44742-3

ZOLA, Émile. *Tereza Raquinová*. 1996. Praha: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury a umění.

Internet sources

ADAMY, Paule. *Frères Goncourt*. [online]. Frères Goncourt, 2001. [cit.2008-02-18] Dostupný z WWW: <<http://www.freres-goncourt.fr/>>.

WOEHR, Jack J. *Synopsis of Volumes of the Rougon-Macquart Cycle*. [online] 2004 – 2008. [cit. 2008-06-19] Dostupný z WWW: <<http://www.well.com/~jax/literature/Rougon-Macquart.html>>

